

BINDING LIST FEB 1 1923

YEAR BOOK
OF THE
Central Conference
OF
American Rabbis

VOLUME XX

EDITED BY
DAVID MARX, JULIAN MORGENSTERN
AND MAX HELLER

YEAR BOOK EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

1910



5670

CONTAINING THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION

HELD IN
CHARLEVOIX, MICHIGAN

JUNE 28 TO JULY 4, 1910

178477
6/3/23

YEAR BOOK

OF THE

Central Conference



Copyright, 1911, by
Central Conference of American Rabbis



BM

30

C4

V.20-21

32

ERRATA

STANDING COMMITTEES FOR 1910-1911

Include in the "Text Book Commission" the names of all members of the Committee on "Religious Education."

Add the name of M. Lovitch to the Committee on "Civil and Religious Marriage Laws."

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY

OF


ABRAHAM GEIGER

PIONEER AND LEADER OF THE REFORM MOVEMENT
IN JUDAISM

IN HONOR OF THE

CENTENARY OF HIS BIRTH

MAY 24, 1910



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Title Page	1
Dedication	3
Officers, 1909-1910	7
Standing Committees, 1909-1910.....	8-11
Officers, 1910-1911	13
Standing Committees, 1910-1911.....	14-17
Temporary Committees, Charlevoix Conference.....	17, 18
Program of Conference	19-22
Members in Attendance'	23-25
Report of Corresponding Secretary.....	25-28
Report of Recording Secretary.....	28-30
Report of Treasurer	30-40
Report of Publication Committee.....	40-47
Report of Finance Committee.....	49-52
Report of Investment Committee.....	53
Report of Committee on Pulpit Bureau.....	53-55
Report of Committee on Social and Religious Union.....	55-64
Report of Committee on Conversion Certificate.....	65-67
Report of Board of Arbitration.....	70
Report of Lyceum Bureau.....	70-73
Temporary Committees Appointed	74
Report of Committee on Sermonic Literature.....	75
Report of Collections for the Alliance Israelite.....	76, 77
Report of Committee on Synagogal Music.....	77-80
Report of Committee on Contemporaneous History.....	83-85
Report of Committee on Religious Education.....	87-90
Discussion of Certificate of Conversion.....	91-94
Observance of Abraham Geiger Day.....	95
Report of Committee on Geiger Centenary	96
Sabbath Services	96-97
Report of Special Committee on Social and Religious Union.....	97, 98
Report of Auditing Committee.....	98-100
Report of Committee on Deaf, Blind, Etc.	104-106
Discussion of Conversion Certificate.....	106-109
Report of Committee on Church and State.....	109-111
Amendment to Constitution Referred.....	111
Report of Committee on Systematic Jewish Theology.....	111
Report of Committee on Minister's Hand Book.....	112-117
Report of Committee on Memorial Resolutions.....	117, 118
Report of Committee on Tracts.....	118
Amendment to Constitution Offered.....	119

Discussion of Minister's Hand Book.....	119-126
Report of Committee on Civic and Religious Marriage Laws.....	126, 127
Paper of Mr. B. H. Hartogensis.....	128-132
Report of Com. on Free Distribution of Conference Publications....	133, 134
Report of Committee on Solicitation of Funds.....	134, 135
Report of Committee on Summer Services.....	135-137
Report of Committee on Personal Prayers.....	137
Report of Committee on President's Message.....	139-141
Report of Committee on the Report of Publication Committee.....	146, 147
Change in By-Laws Adopted.....	147
Report of Committee on Resolutions.....	148-151
Report of Committee on Thanks.....	152, 153
Report of Committee on Nominations.....	153
Election of Officers	154
Constitutional Amendments Offered	154
Adjournment	154
Summary	155-157
Resolutions Sent to Mr. Claude G. Montefiore.....	158

APPENDIX.

A. Message of the President, Rabbi Max Heller.....	159-169
B. Memorial Address (Prof. Sigmund Mannheimer, D.D.), by Rabbi Louis Goss	170-175
C. "The Liberal Movement in English Jewry," Mr. Claude G. Monte- fiore	176-196
D. "The Reform Movement Before Geiger," Rabbi J. S. Raisin....	197-245
E. "Abraham Geiger, the Reformer," Rabbi David Philipson.....	246-283
F. "The Reform Movement After Geiger," Rabbi Max Landsberg....	284-292
F. Discussion, Rabbi Adolf Guttmacher	293-298
G. "Religion and the Social Evil," Rabbi Henry Berkowitz.....	299-313
H. Conference Sermon, Rabbi William Fineshriber.....	314-322
I. Conference Lecture, Rabbi Isaac Rypins	323-329
J. "School Organization," Rabbi Isaac Landman.....	330-343
K. "Post-Biblical History," Rabbi Joseph Stolz	344-346
L. "Instruction in Jewish History," Rabbi G. Deutsch.....	347-361
M. Discussion, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore.....	362-369
Memorial Page to Rabbi Isaac M. Wise.....	370
Past Presidents	371
Deceased Members	371, 372
List of Members	373-381
Publications	382, 383
Books in Traveling Library of the Committee on Church and State....	383

OFFICERS

FOR THE YEAR 1909-1910.

HONORARY PRESIDENT,

KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PRESIDENT,

MAX. HELLER, New Orleans, La.

VICE-PRESIDENT,

SAMUEL SCHULMAN, New York City.

TREASURER,

MOSES J. GRIES, Cleveland, Ohio.

RECORDING SECRETARY,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Cincinnati, Ohio.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY,

DAVID MARX, Atlanta, Ga.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

I. AARON.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
H. BERKOWITZ.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
H. COHEN.....	Galveston, Texas.
W. S. FRIEDMAN.....	Denver, Colo.
M. H. HARRIS.....	New York, N. Y.
E. G. HIRSCH.....	Chicago, Ill.
C. S. LEVI.....	Peoria, Ill.
D. PHILIPSON.....	Cincinnati, Ohio.
W. ROSENAU.....	Baltimore, Md.
I. L. RYPINS.....	St. Paul, Minn.
J. STOLZ.....	Chicago, Ill.

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1909-1910.

Publication.

A. Guttmacher,	S. Foster,	S. H. Goldenson,
M. H. Harris,		A. Lyons.

Relief Fund.

J. Stolz,	C. S. Levi,	I. L. Rypins.
-----------	-------------	---------------

Sermonic Literature.

S. Hirschberg,	A. Brill,	J. Friedlander,
J. H. Kaplan,	H. Levi,	H. Weiss,
	N. Krass.	

Minister's Handbook.

M. H. Harris,	H. G. Enelow,	S. Hirschberg,
H. Berkowitz,	M. M. Feuerlicht,	M. Merritt.

Contemporaneous History.

G. Deutsch,	M. N. A. Cohen,	H. W. Ettelson.
-------------	-----------------	-----------------

Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology.

S. Schulman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. Landsberg,
E. Feldman,	K. Kohler,	F. de Sola Mendes.
M. Friedlander,	M. Lefkowitz,	D. Neumark,
	M. Raisin.	

Social and Religious Union.

H. Weiss,	E. W. Leipziger,	A. Rhine,
J. Jasin,		J. Rappaport.

Lyceum Bureau.

I. M. Franklin,	S. L. Kory,	S. G. Bottigheimer,
I. Aaron,		E. Mannheimer.

Church and State.

W. S. Friedman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. A. Meyer,
A. Simon,	N. Gordon,	D. Lefkowitz,
M. Newfield,		J. B. Wise.

Geiger Centenary.

K. Kohler,	H. G. Enelow,	D. Philipson,
G. Deutsch,	H. H. Mayer,	D. Neumark,
W. Rosenau,		S. Schulman.

Religious Work in Universities.

E. N. Calisch,	H. Englander,	A. Hirschberg,
E. Kahn,	F. Cohn,	B. Elzas,
S. Koch,		I. Warsaw.

Personal Prayers.

H. Berkowitz,	H. Fischer,	I. Landman,
E. Mayer,	C. A. Rubenstein,	M. Salzman.

Religious Education.

M. J. Gries,	H. G. Enelow,	M. H. Harris,
J. S. Kornfeld,	G. A. Kohut,	J. L. Levy,
H. Berkowitz,	W. H. Fineshriber,	L. Grossman,
N. Krass,	J. Krauskopf,	J. H. Landau,
A. Simon,	G. Solomon,	J. Stolz,

Curators of Archives.

J. Morgenstern,	J. Mielziner.
-----------------	---------------

Investments.

I. E. Marcuson,	M. J. Gries,	J. H. Meyer.
-----------------	--------------	--------------

Responsa.

G. Deutsch,	K. Kohler.
-------------	------------

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, Etc.

A. Simon,	D. Blaustein,	J. S. Kornfeld,
S. C. Lowenstein,		S. Peiser.

Civil and Religious Marriage Laws.

E. Frisch,	J. Blau,	S. N. Deinard,
M. Silber,	A. Anspacher,	H. Barnstein,
	J. Silverman.	

Editing Yearbook.

J. Morgenstern,	D. Lefkowitz,	D. Philipson.
-----------------	---------------	---------------

Synagogal Music.

N. Stern,	B. C. Ehrenreich,	M. H. Harris,
H. H. Mayer,	D. Marx,	J. Singer,
L. D. Gross,	L. J. Kopald,	F. de Sola Mendes.

Tracts.

M. Heller,	L. M. Franklin,	D. Philipson,
J. Stolz,		L. Wolsey.

Finance.

D. Marx,	C. S. Levi,	J. Morgenstern.
----------	-------------	-----------------

Summer Services.

G. Zepin,	W. H. Fineshriber,	S. Hecht,
S. R. Cohen,	C. J. Freund,	T. Schanfarber.

Pulpit Bureau.

H. Cohen,	M. Bergman,	E. N. Calisch,
H. Englander,	M. Friedlander,	W. S. Friedman,
M. H. Harris,	J. Rauch,	G. Zepin.

Conversion Formula.

D. Philipson,	H. G. Enelow,	L. M. Franklin,
K. Kohler,		D. Neumark.

Enlargement and Revision of the Prayer Book.

J. Stolz,	M. Heller,	M. H. Harris,
I. S. Moses,	A. Guttmacher,	K. Kohler,
T. Schanfarber,	J. Silverman.	

Free Distribution of Conference Publications.

M. Heller,	D. Philipson,	J. Stolz.
------------	---------------	-----------

Board of Arbitration.

J. Stolz,	G. B. Levi,	T. Schanfarber.
-----------	-------------	-----------------

Soliciting Funds.

J. Morgenstern,	M. J. Gries,	A. Guttmacher,
M. Heller,	D. Marx,	D. Philipson,
	J. Stolz.	

Bible Fund.

D. Philipson,	L. Harrison,	S. Hecht,
W. H. Greenburg,	J. Leucht,	G. B. Levi,
A. G. Moses,	S. Schwartz.	

OFFICERS

FOR THE YEAR 1910-1911.

HONORARY PRESIDENT,

KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PRESIDENT,

MAX. HELLER, New Orleans, La.

VICE-PRESIDENT,

SAMUEL SCHULMAN, New York City.

TREASURER,

MOSES J. GRIES, Cleveland, Ohio.

RECORDING SECRETARY,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Cincinnati, Ohio.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY,

EPHRAIM FRISCH, Pine Bluff, Ark.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

I. AARON.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
W. FINESHRIBER.....	Davenport, Iowa.
L. M. FRANKLIN.....	Detroit, Mich.
W. S. FRIEDMAN.....	Denver, Colo.
M. H. HARRIS.....	New York, N. Y.
D. LEFKOWITZ.....	Dayton, Ohio.
D. MARX.....	Atlanta, Ga.
D. PHILIPSON.....	Cincinnati, Ohio.
I. L. RYPINS.....	St. Paul, Minn.
J. STOLZ.....	Chicago, Ill.
L. WITT.....	Little Rock, Ark.

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1910-1911.

Publication.

A. Guttmacher,	S. Foster,	S. H. Goldenson
M. H. Harris,		J. Silverman.

Relief Fund.

J. Stolz,	C. S. Levi,	I. L. Rypins.
-----------	-------------	---------------

Sermonic Literature.

S. Hirschberg,	A. Brill,	J. Friedlander,
J. H. Kaplan,	H. Levi,	J. Nieto,
	W. Willner.	

Minister's Handbook.

M. H. Harris,	H. G. Enelow,	M. M. Feuerlicht,
L. J. Rothstein,		M. Samfield.

Contemporaneous History.

G. Deutsch,	M. N. A. Cohen,	I. Lewinthal.
-------------	-----------------	---------------

Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology.

S. Schulman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. Landenberg,
A. Cronbach,	M. Friedlander,	K. Kohler,
M. Lefkowitz,	D. Neumark,	M. Raisin,
	W. Rosenau.	

Social and Religious Union.

H. Weiss,	E. W. Leipziger,	A. Rhine,
	J. Rappaport.	

Lyceum Bureau.

L. M. Franklin,	S. L. Kory,	S. G. Bottigheimer,
I. Aaron,		E. Mannheimer.

Church and State.

W. S. Friedman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. A. Meyer,
A. Simon,	N. Gordon,	D. Lefkowitz,
M. Newfield,		J. B. Wise.

Religious Work in Universities.

E. N. Calisch,	H. Englander,	G. Fox,
F. Cohn,	B. Elzas,	A. Hirschberg,
S. Koch,		I. Warsaw.

Personal Prayers.

H. Berkowitz,	H. Fisher,	I. Landman,
E. Mayer,	C. R. Rubenstein,	M. Salzman.

Religious Education.

M. J. Gries,	H. G. Enelow,	M. H. Harris,
J. S. Kornfeld,	J. S. Raisin,	J. L. Levy,
H. Berkowitz,	W. H. Fineshriber,	L. Grossman,
N. Krass,	J. Krauskopf,	J. H. Landau,
A. Simon,	G. Solomon,	J. Stolz.

Curators of Archives.

J. Morgenstern,	J. Mielziner.
-----------------	---------------

Investments.

I. E. Marcuson,	M. J. Gries,	J. H. Meyer.
-----------------	--------------	--------------

Responsa.

G. Deutsch,	K. Kohler.
-------------	------------

Defectives, Dependents, Delinquents.

J. S. Kornfeld,	D. Blaustein,	S. C. Lowenstein,
S. Peiser,		A. Simon.

Civil and Religious Marriage Laws.

E. Frisch,	J. Blau,	S. Deinard,
H. Barnstein,	M. Reichler,	A. Weinstein.

Editing Year Book.

D. Marx,	J. Morgenstern,	M. Heller.
----------	-----------------	------------

Synagogal Music.

H. H. Mayer,	B. C. Ehrenreich,	M. Lovitch,
M. H. Harris,	H. Ettelson,	D. Marx,
F. de Sola Mendes,	J. Singer,	N. Stern.

Tracts.

M. Heller,	L. M. Franklin,	D. Philipson,
J. Stolz,		L. Wolsey.

Finance.

E. Frisch,	D. Marx,	J. Morgenstern.
------------	----------	-----------------

Summer Services.

G. Zepin,	W. H. Fineshriber,	S. R. Cohen,
C. J. Freund,	T. Schanfarber,	S. Hecht.

Pulpit Bureau.

H. Cohen,	M. Bergman,	E. N. Calisch,
H. Englander,	M. Friedlander,	W. S. Friedman,
M. H. Harris,	J. Rauch,	G. Zepin.

Conversion Formula.

D. Philipson,	H. G. Enelow,	L. M. Franklin,
K. Kohler,		D. Neumark.

Revision of Prayer Book.

J. Stolz,	M. Heller,	M. H. Harris,
I. S. Moses,	A. Guttmacher,	K. Kohler,
T. Schanfarber,		J. Silverman.

Board of Arbitration.

J. Stolz,	G. B. Levi,	T. Schanfarber.
-----------	-------------	-----------------

Soliciting Funds.

J. Morgenstern,	M. J. Gries,	A. Guttmacher,
M. Heller,	E. Frisch,	D. Philipson,
	J. Stolz.	

Bible Fund.

D. Philipson,	L. Harrison,	S. Hecht,
W. H. Greenburg,	A. G. Moses,	M. Zielonka.

Week-Day Service.

H. G. Enelow,	Leo M. Franklin,	M. J. Gries.
---------------	------------------	--------------

Synagog and Labor.

S. Foster,	D. Blaustein,	S. N. Deinard,
A. Cronbach,	E. Mayer,	L. Mannheimer.

Text-Book Commission.

M. J. Gries,	D. Philipson,	A. Simon,
F. de Sola Mendes,	L. M. Franklin,	L. Grossman,
E. Calisch,	G. Zepin,	M. Harris,
	J. Stolz.	

Co-operation in Cases of Emergency.

M. Heller,	S. Schulman,	M. J. Gries,
J. Krauskopf,		D. Philipson.

TEMPORARY COMMITTEES OF CHARLEVOIX
CONVENTION.

*President's Message.**J. STOLZ, Chairman.*

W. Friedman,	M. J. Gries,	M. Harris,
S. Hecht,	K. Kohler,	A. J. Messing, Sr.
S. Schulman,	A. Simon,	T. Schanfarber,
	G. Zepin.	

*Resolutions.**D. LEFKOWITZ, Chairman.*

F. Cohn,	S. N. Deinard,	S. Kory,
M. Lovitch,	D. Marx,	I. Rypins,
	L. Witt.	

*Auditing.**G. ZEPIN, Chairman.*

M. Feuerlicht,	I. Marcuson,	M. Newfield.
----------------	--------------	--------------

*Memorial Resolutions.*I. AARON, *Chairman.*

D. Alexander,	J. Blatt,	G. Deutsch,
L. Gross,	A. J. Messing, Jr.	L. Volmer,
J. Mielziner,	H. Wolf.	

*Thanks.*S. HECHT, *Chairman.*

D. Alexander,	M. Messing,	L. Witt.
---------------	-------------	----------

*Nominations.*L. FRANKLIN, *Chairman.*

A. Brill,	H. Ettelson,	W. Fineshriber,
S. Goldenson,	A. Guttmacher,	M. Raisin,
	N. Stern.	

*Press.*I. LANDMAN, *Chairman.*

E. Frisch,	I. Klein,	L. Rothstein.
------------	-----------	---------------

*On Recommendations of Publication Committee.*D. PHILIPSON, *Chairman.*

M. Harris,	D. Lefkowitz,	T. Schanfarber,
J. Stolz,	J. Morgenstern.	

*Special Committee on Report of "Social and Religious Union."*M. HARRIS, *Chairman.*

W. Fineshriber,	L. Franklin,	S. Foster,
K. Kohler,	J. Kornfeld,	A. J. Messing, Sr.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

Program of Twenty-first Annual Convention, Charlevoix, Mich., June 28--July 4, 1910.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 28, 1910.

Meeting of the Executive Committee.

TUESDAY EVENING.

Prayer Rabbi David Philipson
Week-Day Service Rabbi Abram Brill
President's Message Rabbi Max Heller
Memorial Address Rabbi Louis Gross
Prof. Sigmund Mannheimer
Kaddish and Benediction Prof. Gotthard Deutsch

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 29, 1910.

Prayer Rabbi S. N. Deinard
Roll Call.
Reports:

Corresponding Secretary Rabbi David Marx
Recording Secretary Rabbi Julian Morgenstern
Treasurer Rabbi Moses J. Gries
Publication Committee Rabbi Adolf Guttmacher
Finance Committee Rabbi David Marx
Investment Committee Rabbi Isaac E. Marcuson
Pulpit Bureau Rabbi Henry Cohen
Social and Religious Union Rabbi Harry Weiss
Conversion Certificate Rabbi David Philipson

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Reports:

Board of Arbitration	Rabbi Jos. Stolz
Lyceum Bureau	Rabbi Leo. M. Franklin
Sermonic Literature	Rabbi Sam'l Hirschberg
Synagogal Music	Rabbi Nathan Stern
Contemporaneous History	Rabbi G. Deutsch
Responsa	Rabbi G. Deutsch

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

Address "The Liberal Movement in English Jewry"

Mr. Claude G. Montefiore

THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 30, 1910.

Religious Education Day.

Prayer	Rabbi Sol Kory
Report of Religious Education Committee.....	Rabbi M. J. Gries
Review of Text Books on Post-Biblical History...	Rabbi Jos. Stolz
Discussion	Rabbi G. Deutsch
Paper: "School Organization"	Rabbi Isaac Landman
Discussion	Mr. Claude G. Montefiore
"Moving Pictures, Illustrative of Moses, Samson and Esther."	
Exhibit of Religious School Books and Material.	

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

General Discussion of the papers of the morning.

Discussion of Certificate of Conversion.

THURSDAY EVENING.

Round Table:

"The Workingman and the Synagogue".... Rabbi Sol Foster

FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 1, 1910.

Abraham Geiger Day.

Prayer	Rabbi Jos. Blatt
Report of Committee on Geiger Centenary.....	Dr. K. Kohler
Paper: The Reform Movement before Geiger..	Rabbi J. S. Raisin
Paper: Abraham Geiger as Reformer.....	Rabbi D. Philipson
Reading: A Letter of Geiger to his Son.....	Rabbi K. Kohler
Paper: The Reform Movement after Geiger .	Rabbi Max Landsberg
Discussion led by	{ Rabbi M. Newfield
	{ Rabbi Adolf Guttmacher

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

Unfinished Business.

Discussion of the papers of the morning.

FRIDAY EVENING.

Services	Rabbi Max Raisin
Conference Sermon	Rabbi Wm. Fineshriber
Prayer and Benediction	Rabbi A. J. Messing, Sr.

SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 2, 1910.

Services	Rabbi I. E. Marcuson
Torah and Haftorah Readings	Rabbi Louis Witt
Conference Lecture	Rabbi Isaac L. Rypins
Prayer and Benediction	Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber

SUNDAY MORNING, JULY 3, 1910.

Prayer	Rabbi Harry Ettelson
Reports:	

Special Committee on "Social and Religious Union"

Rabbi M. Harris

Auditing Committee

Rabbi G. Zepin

Instruction of Deaf, Blind, etc.

Rabbi A. Simon

Paper: Religion and the Social Evil

Rabbi Hy. Berkowitz

SUNDAY AFTERNOON.

Reports:

Committee on Certificate of Conversion (continued)	
Church and State	Rabbi Wm. Friedman
Systematic Jewish Theology	Rabbi S. Schulman
Minister's Handbook	Rabbi M. Harris
Memorial Resolutions	Rabbi I. Aaron
Tracts	Rabbi M. Heller

MONDAY MORNING, JULY 4, 1910.

Prayer	Rabbi S. Hecht
National Anthem.	
Unfinished Business.	
Report on Minister's Handbook (continued).	
Report: Harmonization of Mosaic and Modern Laws	
	Rabbi Ephraim Frisch

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

Reports:

Free Distribution of Conference Publications.	Rabbi M. Heller
Solicitation of Funds	Rabbi J. Morgenstern
Summer Services	Rabbi G. Zepin
Personal Prayers	Rabbi M. Harris
President's Message	Rabbi Jos. Stolz
Special Committee on Report of Publication Committee	
	Rabbi D. Philipson
Resolutions	Rabbi D. Lefkowitz
Thanks	Rabbi S. Hecht
Nominations	Rabbi L. M. Franklin
Election of Officers.	
Prayer and Benediction	Rabbi K. Kohler

23

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS,
Held at Charlevoix, Mich., June 28--July 4, 1910.

TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 28, 1910.

The opening meeting of the Conference was held in the pavilion of "The Inn," Charlevoix, Mich. Rabbi Max. Heller presided. The invocation was spoken by Rabbi David Philipson. The evening services for the week-day were read by Rabbi Abram Brill. The President delivered his message (Appendix A) which was, upon motion, duly seconded, referred to the Committee on President's Message.

After the announcement of certain slight changes in the program, as printed, Rabbi Louis Gross read a Memorial address (Appendix B) in honor of Prof. Sigmund Mannheimer, our deceased colleague. Dr. G. Deutsch led in the recital of the Kaddish in memory of Prof. Mannheimer and Rabbi B. A. Bonnheim, and then pronounced the benediction.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 29, 1910.

The Conference was called to order at 10 a. m. by President Max. Heller.

Rabbi Samuel N. Deinard opened the session with prayer.

During the Convention, the following fifty-four members responded to the roll-call:

Aaron, Israel, Buffalo, N. Y.

Alexander, David, Toledo, Ohio.

Blatt, Joseph, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Brill, Abram, Greenville, Miss.

Cohn, Fred., Omaha, Neb.

Deinard, Sam'l, Minneapolis, Minn.

Deutsch, G., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Enelow, H. G., Louisville, Ky.
Ettelson, Harry, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Feuerlicht, Morris, Indianapolis, Ind.
Fineshriber, Wm., Davenport, Iowa.
Foster, Sol., Newark, N. J.
Franklin, Leo., Detroit, Mich.
Friedman, Wm., Denver, Colo.
Frisch, Eph., Pine Bluff, Ark.
Goldenson, Sam'l, Albany, N. Y.
Gries, M. J., Cleveland, Ohio.
Gross, Louis, Akron, Ohio.
Grossman, Louis, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Guttmacher, Adolf, Baltimore, Md.
Harris, Maurice, New York.
Hecht, S., Los Angeles, Cal.
Heller, Max., New Orleans, La.
Klein, Israel, Chicago, Ill.
Kohler, Kaufman, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Kornfeld, J. S., Columbus, Ohio.
Kory, Sol. L., Vicksburg, Miss.
Landman, Isaac, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lefkowitz, David, Dayton, Ohio.
Lovitch, Meyer, Paducah, Ky.
Marcuson, Isaac, Sandusky, Ohio.
Marx, David, Atlanta, Ga.
Messing, A. J., Jr., Bloomington, Ill.
Messing, A. J., Sr., Chicago, Ill.
Messing, Mayer, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mielziner, Jacob, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Montefiore, Claude G., London, England.
Morgenstern, Julian, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Newfield, Morris, Birmingham, Ala.
Philipson, David, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Raisin, Jacob, Las Vegas, N. Mex.
Raisin, Max., Meridian, Miss.
Rothstein, Leonard, Alexandria, La.
Rypins, Isaac, St. Paul, Minn.
Schanfarber, Tobias, Chicago, Ill.
Schulman, Sam'l, New York.
Simon, Abram, Washington, D. C.
Stern, Nathan, Providence, R. I.
Stolz, Joseph, Chicago, Ill.
Volmer, Leon, Charleston, W. Va.

Weiss, Harry, Macon, Ga.
Witt, Louis, Little Rock, Ark.
Wolf, Horace, LaFayette, Ind.
Zepin, George, Cincinnati, Ohio.

During the Convention, communications and greetings were received from Hon. Simon Wolf, Rabbis Wm. Rosenau, N. Krass, L. Wintner, A. R. Levy, Sol. Bauer, D. L. Liknaitz, Mendel Silber, I. S. Moses, S. Schulman, Hy. Berkowitz, Hy. Cohen, I. Lewinthal, M. Salzman, H. Englander, Chas. Freund, Leo and Eugene Mannheimer, Max. Landsberg, Wm. H. Greenburg, S. Hirschberg, Mr. A. B. Seelenfreund, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore and Dr. Chas. Singer.

The report of the Corresponding Secretary, Rabbi David Marx, was then read, and on motion received with thanks and referred to the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your Corresponding Secretary begs leave to report that during the months, November, 1909 to June, 1910, all the duties of the office were discharged within his ability.

Immediately, upon ascertaining the time and place of this meeting, letters were sent to all members of the Conference, informing them of same and announcements were furnished the Jewish Press. On May 10th, notices of the tentative program were sent to our members and to the press. On June 16th, the completed program was mailed to all concerned.

The secretaries of the congregations, in which our members officiate, were requested to invite their respective boards to defray the expenses of their rabbi to this Convention and the benefits to be derived therefrom set forth. Quite a number of encouraging replies were received. In accordance with the action of the last Conference, the members were circularized to set aside Sabbath Zachor for making appeals for the Alliance Israelite. The press was informed of our intentions and a congratulatory letter was sent to the Alliance upon the occasion of its jubilee celebration. For all of which we received grateful acknowledgment from that worthy society.

Letters, expressive of our sympathy, together with copies of the Year Book, were sent to all persons and institutions, included in the recommendations of the Committee on Contemporaneous History, and attention

was directed to the action taken by the Conference in memory of departed benefactors and scholars.

The greetings and encouragement of the Conference were conveyed to the liberal Jewish organizations across the waters and the publications of the Conference were placed at their disposal. Most gratifying, sympathetic and appreciative replies were received.

All firms and individuals who had assisted in making successful the exhibit of the Sabbath-School Committee were duly thanked.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations was asked for its assistance in inaugurating services at summer resorts. An assurance of co-operation was received. I refer you to the report of the Chairman of the Committee on Summer Services for full information. To our request that a rabbi be placed in the congested districts of New York, no answer has as yet been received. Both the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Theological Seminary announce that they provide instruction in sociology. Both institutions have under advisement the establishment of courses for those who desire to work amongst deaf mutes.

I believe that the matter of the Ehrlich subvention is now satisfactorily disposed of.

Letters were addressed to the President of the I. O. B. B. and to the National Conference of Jewish Charities calling their attention to the necessity of furnishing the public with an accurate statement of such Jewish Palestinian institutions as are worthy of support. At the last meeting of the latter organization the matter was discussed and arrangements are being made to secure and make public the desired information.

Address cards were sent to all our members. Some responded. Others did not. As a result of the failure of the latter to make known changes in address, there is a miscarriage of mails. It is necessary that the Corresponding Secretary be informed of the proper address of the members to insure the prompt delivery of communications.

All members of committees were notified of their appointment. The respective chairmen were asked to present with their reports, two carbon copies of the same. This is exceedingly important. Compliance therewith will facilitate the appearance of the Year Book.

There have been many calls for our free publications. It may be of interest to know that requests have come for tracts, etc., from South Africa, England, Australia, Honolulu, Russia, Holland and other parts of Continental Europe.

I take pleasure in here recording my appreciation of the uniform courtesy received at the hands of our publishers, The Bloch Publishing Co. Their advice has been valuable; their service, prompt and thorough.

The following vouchers, amounting to \$2,059.76, have been issued:

1909.

Nov. 26,	J. Morgenstern, Cor. Sec'y, trip to New York and Conference Expenses	\$ 85.00
	D. Lefkowitz, Record. Sec'y	5.65
	H. H. Grant, Stenographer, trip to New York	81.60
	Young Israel, printing	15.80
	Starchroom Printing Co., printing	19.17
Dec. 2,	D. Philipson, telegrams	1.54
Dec. 7,	M. Rose, insurance on plates	22.64
	Pension	83.33
	Pension	30.00
	Publisher's Printing Co., binding	174.41
Dec. 10,	Henry Berkowitz, Personal Prayer Committee	59.70
	C. A. Rubenstein, Personal Prayer Committee	9.30
	I. L. Rypins, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	35.00
	Montag Bros., printing	12.80
	Mower-Hobart Co., office supplies	3.50
	D. Marx, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	28.00
	D. Marx, Hymnal Revision Committee	7.00
	D. Marx, Cor. Sec'y	8.25
Dec. 13,	S. Schulman, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	50.00
	H. Berkowitz, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	30.00
	J. Stolz, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	16.00
Dec. 15,	Max. Heller, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	56.00
Dec. 16,	Wm. Rosenau, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	33.00
Dec. 17,	H. H. Grant, stenographic services	100.00
Dec. 20,	M. J. Gries, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	15.00
Dec. 24,	M. J. Gries, Ehrlich Subvention	50.00
	M. J. Gries, M'kitze Nirdamin	10.00
	M. J. Gries	4.39

1910.

Jan. 3,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
Jan. 11,	I. Aaron, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	27.00
Jan. 13,	S. Schulman, expenses Sunday-School exhibit	9.50
	F. D. Elmer, expenses Sunday-School exhibit	5.00
	D. Marx, Cor. Sec'y	8.00
Jan. 18,	M. H. Harris, Exec. Com., trip to Cincinnati	55.50
Jan. 24,	Woolner & Co., reimbursement of interest	10.00
Feb. 3,	M. J. Gries, express Sunday-School exhibit	1.10
	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
Feb. 13,	Publisher's Printing Co., binding	222.56
	Guardian Saving Trust Co., box rental	5.00
	D. Marx, Cor. Sec'y	12.00

Mar. 3,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
	D. Marx, Cor. Sec'y	20.00
Mar. 15,	M. J. Gries, Luncey Subvention	2.40
Apl. 1,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
	Publisher's Printing Co., binding	39.25
May 3,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
	N. Stern, Hymnal Revision Com.	10.10
	Young Israel, printing Digest	14.81
	Berkowitz, printer, circulars Min. Hand Book	7.96
	Colonial Printing Co., printing, office Treas.	18.05
	D. Marx, Cor. Sec'y	7.50
June 2,	J. Morgenstern, postage Year Book	100.00
June 7,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
	Hy. Berkowitz, Personal Prayer Com.	9.00
	Montag Bros., circular letters	3.25
	Murphy Parker Co., printing Haggadoth	68.10
	J. Morgenstern, Record. Sec'y, Com. on Time and Place..	13.00
	D. Marx, Cor. Sec'y	12.00
June 9,	H. Weiss, Social and Relig. Union Com.	16.10
June 10,	Guardian Saving & Trust Co., expenses and service	38.12
	S. H. Goldenson, Publication Com.	6.20
	A. Guttmacher, Publication Com.	8.80
June 14,	Max. Heller, telegrams	2.15

In conclusion, I wish to express to the Conference my thanks for the honor and confidence shown me. Though the work has been exacting, it has been attended to, to the best of my ability. If mistakes were committed, I crave your indulgence.

Fraternally submitted,

DAVID MARX,

Corresponding Secretary.

The report of the Recording Secretary, Rabbi Julian Morgenstern, was then read, and on motion received and ordered printed in the Year Book.

REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Since the last Convention of the Conference, your Executive Committee has held three meetings, on November 16th, in New York City;

on December 7th, in Cincinnati; and on June 28th, in Charlevoix, Mich., at which the following business was transacted.

In view of the unusual size of the year-book of the last Convention it was deemed advisable to postpone consideration of the question of re-printing the report of the Pittsburg Conference and the preparation and publication of a supplementary index of year-books, referred to the Executive Committee at the recent Convention, until next year.

Fifty copies of the Sabbath Eve and Morning Service were upon request presented to the College Settlement of Philadelphia and one hundred copies of the Week-Day Service to the Custodian Home at Rome, N. Y. Fifty copies each of the Sabbath Service and the Hymnal were sent to the Auburn Prison, and twelve copies each of the Sabbath Service and Haggadoth were sent to the Mansfield Correction Institute.

It was decided that henceforth all Conference moneys be invested only in bonds approved by the States of Massachusetts and New York, in certificates of participation in mortgages with banks or companies, or in other mortgages carefully examined and approved by the Committee on Investments, all investments subject to legal advice as to their taxability.

The binding of one thousand Seder Haggadoth was ordered.

The manuscript of the Revised Scriptural Readings, referred to the Executive Committee by the last Convention, was given in charge of the Committee on Revision of the Union Prayer Book.

In accordance with the action taken at the previous Convention, a Committee on Solicitation of Funds for Bible, Tract, and Relief Purposes was appointed, consisting of the President, Corresponding and Recording Secretaries, and chairmen of the Committees on Bible, Tract and Relief Funds. This committee was given power to devise its own plan of operation.

In order to reduce the expenses of the Conference it was unanimously decided that henceforth the Conference pay only one-half the expenses incurred by the members of the Executive Committee in attending its annual Fall meeting.

It was decided to recommend to all our members that a special appeal be made on the Sabbath preceding Purim for the Alliance Israelite Universelle in commemoration of its jubilee.

A subvention of \$10.00 was voted the M'kitze Nirdamin Society and a subscription for one set of 'Luncz' Talmud Yerushalmi was ordered.

Favorable action was taken upon recommendation of the Committee on Contemporaneous History in its report to the recent Conference that the Executive Committee communicate with the Society for Liberal Judaism in Germany, with Mr. Claude G. Montefiore of London, with Mr. Isaac Jacobs of Melbourne, Australia, and Mr. N. Pereferkowitz of St. Petersburg, Russia, expressing the gratification of the Conference at the triumphal onward march of the liberal interpretation of Judaism, and

offering to place at their disposal the publications of the Conference, particularly year-books and rituals.

Re-prints were ordered of the following papers read before the recent Conference: "David Einhorn," Kohler; "Intermarriage," Feldman; "Mixed Marriages and their relation to the Jewish Religion," Schulman; "The Workingman and the Synagog," Foster.

During the year the following resignations from the Conference were accepted: Charles Fleischer, Emil G. Hirsch, I. L. Leucht, Max. Margolis, Samuel Sale, and Stephen S. Wise.

The following members were reinstated: Elias Margolis, Julius Newman, and Michael Gabriel Solomon.

Rabbi A. Blum was elected to membership.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

Recording Secretary.

The report of the Treasurer, Moses J. Gries, was then read. Rabbi Gries received the thanks of the Convention for his labors. On motion, the report was referred to the Auditing Committee for report on the recommendations contained therein.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Treasurer desires to thank the Conference for the honor bestowed upon him and to express his appreciation of the hearty co-operation of the Officers and the Executive Committee of the Conference.

Your Treasurer was duly elected in November of 1909, at the New York Conference, but the moneys of the Conference, its securities and the Treasurer's records were not finally and properly delivered to me until February 2, 1910. I am pleased to report that thus far all records and accounts seem to be correct. Some confusion still continues with some members who claim to have paid in former years and who declare that they do not owe the Conference as much money as is shown upon the books. With the assistance of the former Treasurer I hope to have these accounts satisfactorily adjusted in the very near future.

Although I have been acting as Treasurer in reality only a little more than four months, every member not in good standing on the books has received three notices requesting the payment of the dues. I regret to say that a number are still in arrears, as is shown in the detailed account herewith submitted. It would be a saving of expense and of labor if the members would pay upon receipt of the first notice.

I desire to report that awaiting the action of the Investment Committee, the moneys of the Conference are now invested as follows:

\$23,000 at 4 per cent. per annum. Balance of funds at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum on daily balances. (Balance at this date is \$1,-393.60.)

In order to establish more improved business methods and to safeguard the moneys and securities of the Conference, the Treasurer begs to offer the following resolutions:

1. *Be it Resolved*, That the Treasurer be instructed to make immediate transfer of all books of record, all moneys and all securities, properly endorsed, to the new Treasurer immediately following his election.

2. *Be it Resolved*, That the Executive Committee shall designate the banks in which the moneys and securities of the Conference shall be deposited.

3. *Be it Resolved*, That the moneys of the Conference shall be deposited and all Certificates, Stocks, Bonds and Securities shall be registered in the name of the Conference.

4. *Be it Resolved*, That the securities shall be deposited in a safety deposit box as designated by the Executive Committee, which box shall be opened only in the presence of the Treasurer and a deputy to be appointed by the President.

5. *Be it Resolved*, That the Treasurer's report shall be presented to the Conference after having been duly audited by expert accountants, for which audit the Executive Committee are hereby authorized to make the necessary expenditure.

6. *Be it Resolved*, That the Treasurer shall furnish a bond in an approved surety company, said surety bond to be paid for by the Conference.

7. *Be it Resolved*, That the fiscal year shall end June 10th. This change is recommended in order that the books may be properly closed and a complete financial statement, duly audited, may be presented to the Conference and thus be published in the Year Book.

8. *Be it Resolved*, That the Conference adopt a folded voucher check instead of the present form of check.

This change is recommended in order that the original bills for payment may be attached to the folding voucher check, or if there are no original bills for payment a description of the services rendered, or the nature of the payment, should be embodied in this voucher check together with the address of the payee. This would improve the records and make it possible to check every bill properly.

9. *Be it Resolved*, That the Recording Secretary shall furnish to the Corresponding Secretary and the Treasurer the names and addresses of new members elected and that such names shall not appear in the Year Book until the Treasurer shall have notified the Corresponding Secretary that the first payment of dues has been properly received.

Your Treasurer begs to submit the following Annual Report of the financial conditions of the Conference.

REPORT OF TREASURER FROM NOVEMBER 2, 1909, TO JUNE 17, 1910.

RECEIPTS.

1909.

Dec. 27, Balance of cash in hand of former treasurer as shown
per report of November 2, 1909 \$1,523.03

Dues.

Dec. 15,	Frank L. Rosenthal	\$10.00
	Marcus Salzman	10.00
	Julius H. Meyer	15.00
	M. S. Levy	10.00
	Edward S. Levy	10.00
	A. S. Isaacs	5.00
	Samuel Hirschberg	5.00
	A. Blum	5.00
Dec. 16,	Ed. N. Calisch	5.00
Dec. 27,	Received through Chas. S. Levi—	
	A. R. Levi	10.00
	J. Newman	5.00
	M. Sessler	5.00
	A. Anspacher	5.00
	I. E. Marcuson	5.00
	S. G. Bottigheimer	5.00
	F. Braun	10.00
	M. Harris	5.00
	A. G. Moses	5.00
	H. M. Fischer	10.00
	S. E. Goldstein	15.00
	E. Margolis	25.00
	D. Lefkowitz	5.00
	I. L. Rypins	5.00
	K. Kohler	10.00
	C. A. Rubenstein	10.00
	M. Currick	10.00
	J. H. Landau	5.00
	Sol. Kory	10.00
	Joel Blau	5.00
	E. Leipziger	5.00
	F. A. Levy	10.00
	H. Cohen	5.00

	L. Stern	5.00
	I. S. Moses	10.00
	Theo. Joseph	5.00
	G. N. Hausman	10.00
	F. Mendes	10.00
	Wm. Friedman	5.00
	I. Aaron	15.00
	E. G. Hirsch	10.00
	Martin Meyer	10.00
	S. Hecht	5.00
	G. H. Kohut	5.00
1910.		
Feb. 7,	E. Ellinger	5.00
	L. Kuppin	10.00
Mar. 16,	J. Leonard Levy	5.00
	Harry W. Ettelson	5.00
	Leo Mannheimer	5.00
	Harry Englander	5.00
	Eli Mayer	5.00
	Jacob Mielziner	10.00
	David Neumark	5.00
	Adolph Guttman	5.00
	Nathan Stern	5.00
	Julius Rappaport	10.00
	Isaac Landman	5.00
	Louis Bernstein	10.00
	Max. L. Margolis	5.00
	M. J. Gries	5.00
	G. Deutsch	5.00
	Isadore Rosenthal	5.00
	M. Noot	5.00
Mar. 22,	Aaron P. Drucker	5.00
	J. L. Magnes	5.00
	Isaac L. Rypins	5.00
	H. G. Enelow	5.00
	Joseph Bogen	5.00
	Chas. J. Freund	5.00
	Aaron L. Weinstein	5.00
Mar. 29,	Solomon Foster	5.00
	Leonard J. Rothstein	5.00
	Jacob Nieto	10.00
	M. Friedlander	5.00
Apr. 2,	I. L. Leucht	5.00

Apr. 5,	Wolff Willner	10.00
	Charles Fleischer	5.00
	Leon Harrison	10.00
	David Marx	10.00
Apr. 7,	Samuel H. Goldenson	5.00
	Nathan Gordon	5.00
	Louis Daniel Gross	5.00
	Jacob Singer	5.00
Apr. 15,	David Blaustein	10.00
	Max Reichler	5.00
	Samuel Schulman	5.00
	David Rosenbaum	5.00
Apr. 28,	Abram Simon	5.00
May 6,	Frederick Cohn	5.00
	Jacob S. Raisin	5.00
May 12,	Mendel Silber	5.00
	Simon R. Cohen	5.00
	Abraham R. Levy	5.00
	Wm. H. Fineshriber	5.00
	William Rosenau	5.00
	Emanuel Kahn	5.00
	Louis Stern	5.00
	Montague N. A. Cohen	5.00
May 16,	Horace J. Wolf	5.00
	Joseph Leiser	5.00
	Louis Wolsey	5.00
	Jacob H. Kaplan	5.00
	Samuel Schwartz	5.00
	Wm. H. Greenburg	5.00
	Joseph Blatt	5.00
	George Solomon	10.00
	Emanuel Gerechter	5.00
	Sigmund Frey	5.00
May 27,	Ephraim Frisch	5.00
	Samuel N. Deinard	5.00
	G. George Fox	5.00
	Seymour G. Bottigheimer	5.00
	Bernard C. Ehrenreich	5.00
	Victor Caro	5.00
	Morris Newfield	5.00
	Marcus Salzman	5.00
June 7,	Max. J. Merritt	5.00
	Samuel Koch	10.00
	Nathan Krass	5.00

	Ephraim Feldman	5.00	
	M. Spitz	10.00	
June 8,	Meyer Lovitch	5.00	
June 11,	Joseph Jasin	5.00	
	M. Sessler	5.00	
	Moses P. Jacobson	15.00	
June 16,	Max C. Curriek	5.00	
	Joseph Silverman	10.00	
	Abram Hirschberg	5.00	
	Harry H. Mayer	10.00	
June 17,	Isadore Lewenthal	5.00	
	Emanuel Schreiber	5.00	
	Martin Zielonka	10.00	
			\$ 875.00

Tract Fund.

1909.

Dec. 15,	Newark, N. J., congregation	\$ 15.00	
	Temple Sinai, New Orleans	10.00	
	Cong. B'nai Yeshurum, Des Moines	25.00	
	Cong. B'nai Israel, Davenport, Iowa	2.00	
			\$ 52.00

Publication.

1909.

Dec. 15,	Bloch Publishing Company	\$ 500.00	
Dec. 27,	Bloch Pub. Co. (from Chas. S. Levi)	1,000.00	

1910.

Jan. 3,	Bloch Publishing Company	600.00	
Jan. 28,	Bloch Publishing Company	500.00	
Mar. 2,	Bloch Publishing Company	250.00	
Apr. 2,	Bloch Publishing Company	300.00	
Apr. 28,	Bloch Publishing Company	200.00	
May 31,	Bloch Publishing Company	200.00	
June 8,	Bloch Publishing Company	213.74	
			\$3,763.74

Interest.

1910.

Jan. 10,	Interest on Bills Receivable paid	\$ 150.00	
Feb. 1,	The Commercial National Bank on Certificates of Deposit	50.10	
	Interstate Bank & Trust Co., on Certificates of Deposit	9.00	
Mar. 31,	The Guardian Savings & Trust Company, interest on account to April 1, 1910	145.19	
			\$ 354.29

Investment Account.

1910.		
Jan. 10,	Bills Receivable paid	\$12,000.00
Feb. 1,	The Commercial German National Bank, Certificates of Deposit	6,680.00
	Interstate Bank & Trust Company, Certificates of Deposit	1,200.00
		<hr/>
		\$19,880.00

General Expense.

1910.		
Apr. 7,	Bloch Publishing Company, on account books	
	N. Krass	\$ 3.15
		<hr/>
	Total Receipts	\$26,451.21

DISBURSEMENTS.

General Expense.

1909.		
Dec. 14,	Julian Morgenstern, for trip to New York and expense of Conference	\$ 85.00
	David Lefkowitz	5.65
	H. H. Grant	81.60
	Young Israel	15.80
	Starchroom Publishing Co.	19.17
Dec. 16,	David Philipson	1.54
	Montag Bros.	12.80
	Mower-Hobart Co.	3.50
	David Marx	8.25
1910.		
Jan. 5,	H. H. Grant	100.00
	Moses J. Gries	4.39
	M. J. Gries, Foreign Exchange for A. B. Ehrlich	50.00
	M. J. Gries, Foreign Exchange for M'kitze Nirdamin Society	10.00
Jan. 21,	David Marx	8.00
	Samuel Schulman	9.50
	Rev. Franklin D. Elmer	5.00
	Moses J. Gries	1.10
Mar. 2,	Guardian Savings & Trust Company	5.00
	David Marx	12.00
Mar. 16,	David Marx	20.00
Apr. 15,	A. M. Luncz	2.40

May 12,	Nathan Stern	10.10	
	Young Israel	14.81	
	Berkowitz	7.96	
	Colonial Printing Company	18.05	
	David Marx	7.50	
June 8,	Julian Morgenstern	100.00	
June 16,	Montag Bros.	3.25	
	Julian Morgenstern	13.00	
	David Marx	12.00	
	Harry Weiss	16.10	
	Guardian Savings & Trust Co.	38.12	
			\$ 701.59

Executive Committee.

1909.			
Dec. 16,	I. L. Rypins	\$ 35.00	
	David Marx	28.00	
1910.			
Jan. 5,	Samuel Schulman	50.00	
	Henry Berkowitz	30.00	
	Joseph Stolz	16.00	
	Max. Heller	56.00	
	Wm. Rosenau	33.00	
	Moses J. Gries	15.00	
	Sigmund Rheinstrom	15.80	
	Israel Aaron	27.00	
Jan. 11,	M. H. Harris	55.50	
			\$ 361.30

Publication.

1909.			
Dec. 16,	Morris Rose	\$ 22.64	
	Publishers Printing Co.	177.41	
	Henry Berkowitz	59.70	
	Charles Rubenstein	9.30	
	David Marx	7.00	
1910.			
Jan. 5,	Publishers Printing Co.	1.43	
Mar. 2,	Publishers Printing Co.	222.56	
Apr. 27,	Publishers Printing Co.	39.25	
June 16,	Henry Berkowitz	9.00	
	Murphy Parker Co.	68.10	
	S. H. Goldenson	6.20	
	A. Guttmacher	8.80	
			\$ 631.39

Pension.

Dec. 16,	Pension	\$ 83.33
	Pension	30.00
1910.		
Jan. 21,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
Feb. 3,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
Mar. 16,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
Apr. 27,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
May 12,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
June 16,	Pension	25.00
	Pension	15.00
		<hr/> \$ 353.33

Interest.

1910.		
Jan. 24,	Refund of overpayment	\$ 10.00
	Cash on hand:	
	General Fund	\$ 5,001.94
	Relief Fund	19,339.66
	Tract Fund	52.00
		<hr/> \$24,393.60
		<hr/> \$26,451.21

SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Receipts.

Balance of cash in hands of former Treasurer.....	\$ 1,523.03
Dues	875.00
Tract Fund	52.00
Publication	3,763.74
Interest	354.29
Investment Account	19,880.00
General Expense	3.15
	<hr/> \$26,451.21

Disbursements.

General Expense	\$ 701.59	
Executive Committee	361.30	
Publication	631.39	
Pension	353.33	
Interest	10.00	
Cash on hand.		
General Fund	\$ 5,001.94	
Relief Fund	19,339.66	
Tract Fund	52.00	
	<hr/>	24,393.60
		<hr/> \$26,451.21

Statement of General Fund.

1909.

Nov. 2, Balance	\$3,885.86	
One-half Dues	\$ 437.50	
One-half Interest	172.15	
One-half Publication	1,566.17	
	<hr/>	\$2,175.82
Less:		
General Expense	\$ 698.44	
Executive Committee Expense	361.30	
	<hr/>	1,059.74
Gain		<hr/> 1,116.08
Present Balance		<hr/> \$5,001.94

Statement of Relief Fund.

Nov. 2, Balance	\$17,517.17	
One-half Dues	\$ 437.50	
One-half Interest	172.14	
One-half Publication	1,566.18	
	<hr/>	\$2,175.82
Less:		
Pensions	353.33	
Gain		<hr/> 1,822.49
Present Balance		<hr/> \$19,339.66

Statement of Tract Fund.

1909.		
Nov. 2,	Balance	\$00.00
	Donations	52.00
		<hr/>
	Present Balance	\$52.00

Summary of Funds.

General Fund	\$ 5,001.94
Relief Fund	19,339.66
Tract Fund	52.00
Cash on hand as per Statement	<hr/> \$24,393.60

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES,

June 17, 1910.

Treasurer.

The report of the Publication Committee, Rabbi A. Guttmacher, Chairman, was then read by the Corresponding Secretary.

REPORT OF THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Publication Committee, intrusted with the publication and handling of the publications of the C. C. A. R., submitted at the Conference in New York a report which included the first four months of the fiscal year 1909-10. This report, therefore, covers but eight months, October 1, 1909 to June 1, 1910.

Two congregations and three public institutions have been added to the number of those using the Union Ritual, making a total of 278 congregations and about 20 institutions. The Prayerbook, in existence 16 years, shows a sale of 108,563 copies.

The committee is aware of the bad condition of the Hebrew type in the Prayerbook, especially in Volume I. The repair of plates would call for a large outlay of money. In view of the fact that since the Conference met in Louisville in 1904, the revision of the book has been repeatedly discussed, the committee deems it unwise to suggest the repairing of the plates. It unanimously recommends that the Prayerbook be revised.

The committee further recommends:

That the text of the new "Scriptural Readings" be taken from the new Bible translation; that the large number of holiday sermons on hand makes it unnecessary to publish holiday sermons this year; that 80 books of Vol. II, Prayerbook, flexible morocco (ed. 1894) be reduced from \$2.50 to \$2.00;

that the stiff morocco binding be discontinued; that the "Sermons by American Rabbis" be placed on the free list; that the Conference place on the market 13 copies of Ehrlich's "Die Psalmen" and 25 copies each of Vols. I and II of Ehrlich's "Randglossen z. Hebr. Bibel."

That a new edition of the Haggadoth be authorized. 1,366 copies were sold during the year and 685 copies are on hand; that a new edition of the Union Hymnal be authorized. 1,143 copies were sold during the last year and 343 copies are on hand; that there shall be printed 3,000 copies of Vol. II, Prayerbook; 3,000 copies of Sabbath Eve and Morning Services; 1,000 copies of week-day services; that the Committee deems it unnecessary to employ an accountant to take the inventory of the stock, that in the future the chairman of the committee delegate a member of the committee to count the stock. The committee desires to call your attention to the growing demand for the evening and morning Sabbath Services and the Week-day Services. The falling off of the sale of the regular Vol. I is wholly due to the large sale of the smaller book. During the last eight months, 1,349 Vol. I were sold and 2,260 Sabbath Evening and Morning Services, and 446 Week-day Services. Our agents recommend that the price of the smaller book be made 50 cents. The committee, though not unanimous, favors that the sale price be raised to 40 cents. This matter calls for the most serious deliberation, for it affects the chief source of our revenue.

To our agents, books to the value of \$5,509.84 were delivered. Sales, \$2,536.71. Remittances in cash, \$3,763.74. Charged to Conference (see Exhibit F), \$808.30. Balance due, June 1, 1910, \$785.04. Stock on hand, \$2,257.87.

In submitting our report and that of the Bloch Publishing Co., we most heartily recommend the renewal of our contract with our agents. The Bloch Publishing Co. does the work of the Conference with dispatch and diligence and is always anxious to assist the committee with practical advice.

Respectfully submitted,

A. GUTTMACHER, *Chairman*,
S. FOSTER,
S. H. GOLDENSON,
M. H. HARRIS,
A. LYONS.

JUNE 5, 1910.

Dr. A. Guttmacher, Chairman of the Publication Committee, C. C. A. R.

DEAR SIR:—We respectfully submit herewith our report covering the months October, 1909-May, 1910, both inclusive. Our report covering June-September, 1909, was sent to you last October and was submitted, in printed form, to the Conference at its meeting held in New York in November. That

report and the one submitted now, cover the whole fiscal year, June 1, 1909, to May 31, 1910.

Comparing with the previous year, there again has been a slight falling off in the sales of the Union Prayer Book. A careful scrutiny of the orders received during the year has convinced us that this falling off, to a large degree, is due to the use, by the congregations, of the abridged edition for the Sabbath. This edition originally intended, we believe, for use in the religious schools, is being used by the congregations for the regular Services, instead of the larger book. We would therefore recommend that the price of the abridged edition be raised from twenty-five cents to fifty cents, allowing the usual discount for quantity. This may, in a measure, offset the loss entailed by the decreased sales of the complete book.

This recommendation was made to your committee when it met at our office in May, at which time we suggested how the cost of publication could be somewhat reduced by eliminating certain unnecessary features in the binding of the books. This saving, in the aggregate, will amount to a fairly large sum.

We have also recommended that the Sermons be transferred to the free list, as practically none are sold during the year. In connection with the distribution of these books and the other Conference publications which are issued gratis, we would call your attention to the paragraph in our report of June 9, 1909. We believe there are many libraries, ministers and others who would gladly pay the postage on the books and pamphlets, if the matter was brought to their attention.

There was some increase in the sales of the Haggadoths. We sent out thousands of circulars, which met with fair response. Our offer to the members of the Conference to supply them with circulars for distribution among their members met with practically no response, only three members requesting us to furnish them with the circulars. More generous support in our effort to sell this book would, no doubt, largely increase the sales.

We hold in stock, subject to your orders, thirteen copies of Ehrlich's "Die Psalmen" and twenty-five copies each Vols. I and II of Ehrlich's "Randglossen z. Hebr. Bibel."

We recommend that the following be printed, so as to be in readiness for the demand that comes with the fall holidays:

U. P. Book, Vol. II.	3,000
Sabbath Eve. and Morn. Ser.	3,000
Week Day Service	1,000

The sheets of Vol. II should be ready for binding by August 15. The quantity needed of the various styles can be given at that time, and the books be ready by September 1. If any saving can be effected by printing Vol. I at the same time, then we would recommend that 2,000 copies of that volume be printed.

We sincerely hope that the attention which we give to business of the Conference meets with your commendation. No effort is spared to carry out your instructions with care and promptness, and we believe that at no time has there been given a cause for complaint. We therefore trust that you will grant a renewal of our contract.

With thanks for the courtesies extended by yourself, your committee and the officers of the Conference, and with cordial greetings to you all, we are,

Very truly yours,

BLOCH PUBLISHING CO.,

CHARLES E. BLOCH, *Prop.*

EXHIBIT A.

BOOKS RECEIVED OCTOBER 1, 1909-JUNE 1, 1910.

1909		
Aug. 9—100 Union Prayer Books, II, unbound.....		\$ 56.25
Oct. 23—202 Evening and Morning Service.....	\$.17½	35.35
Oct. 25—791 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	138.42
Oct. 27—248 Union Prayer Books, I, leather.....	1.05	260.40
Nov. 17— 2 Union Prayer Books, I, leather.....	1.05	2.10
Nov. 17— 3 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	.52
1910		
Jan. 6—504 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth.....	.70	352.80
Jan. 14—882 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	154.35
Jan. 14—122 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	21.35
Jan. 19—500 Union Hymnal30	150.00
Jan. 29—150 Union Prayer Books, I, flex. morocco.....	1.75	262.50
Mar. 17—500 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	87.50
Apr. 8—932 Union Haggadoth, cloth17½	163.10
Total		\$1,684.64
Stock on hand September 30, 1909.....		3,825.20
Grand total		\$5,509.84

EXHIBIT B.

STOCK INVENTORY, MAY 31, 1910.

150 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth	\$.70	\$105.00
92 Union Prayer Books, I, leather	1.05	96.60
66 Union Prayer Books, I, morocco	1.40	92.40
32 Union Prayer Books, I, extra morocco	1.75	56.00

543 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth70	380.10
540 Union Prayer Books, II, leather	1.05	567.00
94 Union Prayer Books, II, morocco	1.40	131.60
112 Union Prayer Books, II, extra morocco	1.75	196.00
460 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	80.50
181 Week Day Service.....	.17½	31.68
343 Union Hymnal30	102.90
167 Union Haggadoth, cloth17½	29.22
351 Union Haggadoth, cloth, gilt32	112.32
167 Union Haggadoth, limp leather40	66.80
15 Sermons, cloth85	12.75
788 Sermons, paper25	197.00
Total		\$2,257.87

EXHIBIT C.

SALES FROM OCTOBER 1, 1909-MAY 31, 1910.

830 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth	\$.70	\$581.00
245 Union Prayer Books, I, leather	1.05	257.25
38 Union Prayer Books, I, morocco	1.40	53.20
236 Union Prayer Books, I, extra morocco	1.75	413.00
83 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth70	58.10
21 Union Prayer Books, II, leather	1.05	22.05
4 Union Prayer Books, II, morocco	1.40	5.60
79 Union Prayer Books, II, extra morocco	1.75	138.25
2260 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	395.49
446 Week Day Service17½	78.05
682 Union Hymnal30	204.60
1325 Union Haggadoth, cloth17½	231.88
12 Union Haggadoth, cloth, gilt32	3.84
29 Union Haggadoth, limp leather40	11.60
22 Year Book, paper35	7.70
14 Year Book, cloth70	9.80
9 Sermons, paper25	2.25
8 Sermons, cloth85	6.80
100 Union Prayer Books, II, unbound.....		56.25
Total		\$2,536.71

EXHIBIT D.

MONTHLY SALES.

1909—October	\$ 516.50
November	282.15
December	287.38
1910—January	205.37
February	245.02
March	215.25
April	413.09
May	371.95
Total	<u>\$2,536.71</u>
Balance due from October 1, 1909.....	2,105.11
Grand total	<u>\$4,641.82</u>

REMITTANCES.

1909—November 4	\$ 500.00
November 27	500.00
December 10	500.00
December 28	600.00
1910—January 21	500.00
February 24	250.00
March 18	300.00
April 25	200.00
May 25	200.00
June 4	213.74
Total	<u>\$3,763.74</u>
Charged to Conference (see Exhibit F)	808.30
	<u>\$4,572.04</u>

EXHIBIT E.

SUMMARY.

Balance due Conference October 1, 1909.....	\$2,105.11
Value of Books received, etc. (see Exhibit A)	5,509.84
	<u>\$7,614.95</u>
Stock on Hand (Exhibit B)	2,257.87

Cash Remittances (Exhibit D)	3,763.74
Charged to Conference (Exhibit F)	808.30
Total	<u>\$6,829.91</u>
Balance due	\$ 785.04
Above balance represents the sales for April and May.	

EXHIBIT F.

BOOKS, ETC., CHARGED TO THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF
AMERICAN RABBIS.

The following items consist of books sent out on orders from the Conference. Everything is charged to the Conference at the actual cost.

1909

Oct. 2	Year Books, Sermons, postage, expressage, etc., distributed and expended during the months of July 26–October 1, 1909	\$ 31.29
Oct. 30	To O. Wise, San Francisco: 13 Yr. Bks. (1 cloth), \$4.90, exp. 96c. To Rosenberg Library: 13 Yr. Bks. (1 cloth), \$4.90, exp., \$1.02. To Heller and Schreiber, each: 1 Yr. Bk., clo., \$1.40; post., 26c.; postage, etc., on Tracts, etc. 72c.	14.16
Nov. 24	To Miss J. Selig, Philadelphia: 50 Sab. Eve. & Morn. Service, \$8.75; exp., 45c.	9.20
Nov. 17	To Dr. Blum: 100 Week Day Service.....	17.50
Dec. 31	To Custodian Home, Rome: 100 Week Day Ser., \$17.50; Yr. Bks., postage, expr., etc., distributed and expended from Nov. 8 to Dec. 15, 1909, \$18.11	35.61
Dec. 31	Postage, etc., for April.....	.76
Dec. 31	Year Books (charged back): 1,259 paper, \$440.65; 289 cloth, \$202.30	642.95

1910

Jan. 5	To Dr. A. Guttman: 50 Hymnals, \$15.00; expr., 85c.	15.85
Jan. 15	Rebate on 144 Sab. Eve. & Morn. Ser. (to N. O. Jew. O. Home), at 2½c., \$3.60; 50 Sab. Eve. & Morn. Ser. (to Dr. Guttman), \$8.75; expr., 60c.	12.95
Jan. 31	Rebate on 50 Sab. Eve. & Morn. Ser. (Newark H. O. A.), \$1.25; postage, etc., on pamphlets during Jan., \$1.80...	3.05
Mar. 7	To Rev. Philo: 12 U. P. Bks., 1 clo., \$8.40.....	11.30
Mar. 31	Postage and expressage on Sermons, etc., from Feb. 11 to Mar. 31	2.48

Apr. 7	Rebate on 100 Sab. Eve. & Morn. Ser. (Cleveland Jew. O. A.)	2.50
Apr. 9	Set Conference Publ., Synod, Aspects and Yr. Bk. (free), 1 Sermons, paper, 25c.; set U. P. Bks., \$1.40; U. Hag., 18c.; U. Hymn., 30c., and post., 77c., \$2.90 to Pereferkowitz, St. Petersburg; ditto to Dr. Vogelstein, Stettin; ditto to Mr. Henry, London.....	8.70
Total		\$808.30

EXHIBIT G.

NEW CONGREGATIONS.

The Union Prayer Book has been introduced in the following congregations since October 1, 1909:

Gadsden, Ala.

New Orleans (Jewish Orphans' Home).

Newark (Hebrew Orphan Asylum).

Mattapan, Mass. (Leop. Morse Home).

Hoboken, N. J.

Rabbi Stolz—Inasmuch as a number of radical changes are proposed by the Publication Committee, and inasmuch as the details of the Bloch Publishing Co.'s work have not been read to us, I move that this report be received and referred to a special committee on publication, to report back with recommendations.

Seconded.

Rabbi Morgenstern—At previous Conferences the report of the Publication Committee was referred to a special committee, but at the last Conference a change was made, and the report was referred to the Auditing Committee. This was done partly in accordance with a provision in the Constitution and By-Laws, and partly because it seems expedient to do so. It is essential that the Auditing Committee be enabled to gain a complete survey of the finances of the Conference. There is no reason why it can not consider these recommendations as efficiently as any special committee. I therefore offer the amendment that this report be referred to the regular Auditing Committee.

Rabbi Harris—I second that amendment. These recommenda-

tions are the result of the deliberations of a committee, and shall we endlessly re-refer?

Rabbi Philipson—I offer an amendment to the amendment, namely, that the portion of the report which refers to sales, etc., be referred to the Auditing Committee.

Rabbi Foster—I second Dr. Philipson's amendment.

Rabbi Stolz—I would be willing to accept a part of the amendment as part of my motion, namely, that the portion of the report which refers to financial matters exclusively be referred to the Auditing Committee. Referring it to the special committee does not mean that we shall not have an opportunity to discuss it hereafter. We shall have this opportunity after a committee has very carefully considered it, and brought recommendations before this Conference. There are matters of very grave importance here which ought not to be decided on the spur of the moment. It will facilitate matters if we refer the report to a special committee to properly consider it, and then bring it before us. If Dr. Philipson permits, I would move that the financial part of the report be referred to the Auditing Committee, and the other part to a special Committee on Publication.

Rabbi Philipson—I would be very glad to, were it not for the fact that I think we would be casting a reflection upon the Publication Committee by so doing. It seems to me that this Publication Committee must have considered these matters carefully before making these recommendations. If it be that there are portions of this report that fall in line with the work of other committees, then when we come to examine those questions, we may simply refer them to the proper committee.

Rabbi Stolz—It has been said that it is a reflection on our Publication Committee to refer its report to another committee. Every report that is brought here by a committee ought to be referred to a special committee for consideration. That has been the regular order of procedure from the very foundation of our Conference and is the order of procedure in every parliamentary body. It is no reflection whatever.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I hesitate to take the floor again to discuss

matters of procedure. But the advisability of raising the price of the Sabbath Evening and Morning services hinges very much upon the disposal that will be made of the report of the Finance Committee. We are hardly in a position to discuss this matter intelligently now. Furthermore, the ex-President made the point that it would be discourteous to the Publication Committee to refer these matters to another committee. This has been the procedure every year. It is not an innovation and consequently the Publication Committee could not attach that significance to this action. I therefore regard it as advisable in every way to refer the recommendations to one committee that will consider the report of the Finance Committee, and report back after a careful consideration of the entire financial condition of the Conference.

Rabbi Philipson—In view of this explanation I will withdraw my amendment.

Rabbi Foster—I do not think it wise to withdraw the second portion of that amendment for this reason: The question of raising the cost of a book from twenty-five to forty cents is not so much a question of finance as of ethics.

The previous question was called for and put.

The first amendment was lost. The second amendment was lost. The original motion carried.

The report of the Finance Committee was then read by its chairman, Rabbi David Marx.

REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN:—Your Committee on Finances, whose duty it is to consider all recommendations of appropriation of money and to present to the annual meeting of the Conference a statement of its finances, submits the following report.

Since 1907, there has been an annual decrease in the General Fund. Despite the most rigid economy practiced this year, our expenses continue to exceed our income.

At the beginning of the year 1907-08 we had a cash balance of \$4,608.98. Our income was \$1,672.30. Our expenditures amounted to \$2,375.95, creating a deficit of \$703.65 and leaving a balance of \$3,905.33.

For 1908-09 our income was \$2,671.16. Our expenses were \$2,690.63, an

increase of expenses over income of \$19.47. The smallness of this excess was due to the receipt of \$210.50 in donations to the Tract Fund, and a refund of \$700, overcharges for binding.

On the other hand, our Relief Fund has continued to grow. It was at the beginning of the year 1907-08, \$12,953.57. It increased that year \$1,702.58, during the year 1908-09 \$2,861.02 and during the year 1909-10 \$1,827.49, so that to-day the Relief Fund is represented by \$19,339.66. In view of the continuous excess of expenses over income in the General Fund, the Finance Committee recommended to the last Conference that one-half of all interest monies be placed in the General Fund. This recommendation became, by your consent, operative and increased our revenue from this source \$90.59.

Despite this change, and although our income this year exceeds the very conservative figures of last year's estimate, which was \$2,040, we again face a deficit.

Our income this year is as follows:

From One-Half Dues	\$ 437.50
From Interest	172.15
From Publications	1,566.17
From General Expense	3.15
From Tract Donations	52.00

Total\$2,230.97

Inclusive of \$52, donations to the Tract Fund.

Our expenditures have been very heavy. They are as follows:

Executive Committee	\$ 361.30
Subventions	62.40
Sabbath-School Committee	19.99
Corresponding Secretary	67.75
Social and Religious Union Committee.....	16.10
Other expenses	537.50

Making a total of.....\$1,065.04

We owe:

The Publisher's Printing Co.	\$ 301.60
Central Trust & Safe Deposit Co.	10.00
Montag Bros., for programs.....	10.00
Year Book and reprints (estimated).....	1,250.00
Expenses of this Conference (estimated).....	225.00

\$1,796.60

Making a general total of \$2,861.64, again showing a deficit of \$682.67.

Even granting that the estimate of expenses is somewhat higher than they really may be, we have published no tract; the subvention voted Dr.

Newmark has not been called for; only a very few committees have so far presented bills, and the bill of \$20 for Treasurer's bond is still outstanding.

It requires very little ability in the domain of finance to realize that either our expenses must be reduced and our activities crippled, or our income must be materially increased.

The outlook for the year 1910-11 is not very encouraging. This year will be one of even greater expenditures or rather of smaller income. If the recommendations of our publishing house and of the Publication Committee meet with your approval, we shall print new editions of the Union Prayer Book, Vols. I and II, the Sabbath Evening and Morning Book, the Weekday Service Book, Hymnal and Haggadoth. It is difficult to compute the cost of these publications, as that will depend upon the bindings used. Our income from the main source of our revenues, namely, our publications, will be reduced. The revenues for the General Fund for the year, basing our estimate upon receipts from publications in the year 1908-09 and allowing for expenses of production, will be somewhat as follows:

Income—From One-Half Dues	\$ 450.00
From Interest	450.00
From Publication	1,200.00
	<hr/>
	\$2,100.00

Estimated expenditures:

Year Book and postage	\$1,050.00
Subventions already granted	125.00
Corresponding Secretary	300.00
Treasurer's bond	20.00
Incidentals	200.00
Report next Conference and expenses.....	175.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,870.00

Leaving a balance of \$230 for the expenses of all committees, for the Executive Board meeting, for all subventions that may be authorized and approved and for all other activities of the Conference. We expended last year for the Executive Committee meeting, other committees and subventions, \$472.79.

It is evident that the amount at our disposal is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of the Conference.

The approximate income of the Conference remains about the same. The expenditures continue to grow. In view of this fact and of the possible likelihood of our revenues from publications diminishing, since so many congregations having introduced the Prayer Book, no longer order in large quantities, your committee is compelled to urge such legislation as will serve to remedy the difficulties.

1. We concur in the recommendation of the Publication Committee that the price of the Sabbath service book be advanced.

2. We recommend that the Committee on Tract Fund make every effort to secure donations for same. Tracts ought not to be paid for out of the meager income of the Conference.

3. That there be printed on the reverse of the title page of our tracts a clear presentation of the purpose of their issuance, together with a request for donations to this fund.

4. That most strenuous efforts be made for establishing the relief fund, independent of the receipts from Conference publications.

It is patent that the raising of money from outside sources, for carrying on the work of the Conference, is hardly feasible. The same is not true in regard to either the Tract or the Relief Fund. Congregations and individuals should be made to realize that the worthy, aged and incapacitated men who have given lives of service to the Jewish cause must be provided for in their necessity.

Your committee feels it its duty to recommend, as a temporary measure and until such time as such measure be no longer necessary, that whereas the expenses of the Conference are in excess of the receipts of the General Fund, while the expenses of the Relief Fund are less than its income from dues and interest, that all receipts from publications be placed in the General Fund.

Unless such remedy, or some other at present not within the grasp of the Finance Committee, be applied, it will be only a matter of a few years when we shall become a fraternal insurance organization, without the necessary funds to conduct the primary activities of the Conference.

Your committee has not arrived at this conclusion hastily. We are aware that, even with us apart from our duty as members of this committee, sentimental reasons have much to advance against such radical measures. However, we realize that a disembodied spirit is not the life of a physical organization, that food is essential to nourish a physical body in order to keep the spirit alive, that a Relief Fund without a General Fund means the shipwreck of the Conference. It is for you to say whether, in its final analysis, this question of distribution of income does not depend upon what is really the more important, the possible needs of the fewest or the ever growing larger activities of the Conference.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID MARX,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

Finance Committee.

Rabbi Stolz—I move you that the report be received and referred to the Auditing Committee.

Rabbi Philipson—It seems to me that you have already taken

action in regard to one of the recommendations of the Finance Committee in disposing of the report of the Publication Committee. Therefore, I amend Dr. Stolz's motion to this extent that this whole report, with the exception of that one item, be referred to the Auditing Committee.

Rabbi Stolz—I will accept that amendment. Carried.

The following Report of the Investment Committee was read by Rabbi I. E. Marcuson, its chairman.

REPORT OF THE INVESTMENT COMMITTEE.

To the C. C. A. R.:

GENTLEMEN:—Your Committee on Investments was instructed by the Executive Committee that henceforth all Conference monies be permanently invested only in bonds approved by the States of Massachusetts and New York in certificates of participation in mortgages with banks or companies or in other mortgages carefully examined and approved by the Committee on Investments.

Your committee, feeling that it should endeavor to secure as large a return as consistent with safety, made no purchases during the year. Through the efforts of the Treasurer, a very favorable arrangement was made with the Guardian Savings & Trust Company of Cleveland, Ohio, whereby the Conference is receiving 4 per cent. on monies left with them on savings account, and 3 per cent. on daily balances, and we can afford to wait until a good opportunity offers itself before making a permanent investment.

Respectfully submitted,

I. E. MARCUSON, *Chairman*,
MOSES J. GRIES,
JULIUS H. MEYER.

On motion, the Report of the Investment Committee was referred to the Auditing Committee.

The Report on Pulpit Bureau was then read, by the Corresponding Secretary, in the absence of Rabbi Henry Cohen, its chairman.

REPORT ON PULPIT BUREAU.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN:—As Chairman of the Pulpit Bureau I beg to report that in the month of May, I sent the following letter to eight colleagues:

Dear Colleague: With a view of forming a permanent, self-perpetuating

committee, for the general advantage of rabbis and congregations alike, I shall be glad to have the benefit of your opinion as to the best means of effecting the following purposes, and such others as you may suggest:

(a) The bringing of congregations who need ministers in touch with rabbis who need positions.

(b) The reconciliation of rabbi and congregation and the adjustment of grievances, when circumstances arise that call for such service.

(c) The passing upon the capability of candidates for specific positions and upon the desirability of congregations.

(d) The weeding out of undesirables.

It is understood that the committee or sub-committees appointed, act in an advisory capacity only, and that it will be necessary to form permanent connections in all states and districts. It is suggested that the fewer the members of the committee or sub-committees, the better; and that means be taken of notifying congregations that such a permanent committee exists.

Since this is a new field for us, it would be well to consult the ministers or interested laymen of other denominations as to the *modus operandi*.

The President of the Conference having appointed me chairman of the Pulpit Bureau, I have selected the following rabbis to serve in conjunction with me: Moise Bergman, New Orleans; Ed. N. Calisch, Richmond; Hy. Englander, Providence; H. Friedlander, Oakland; Wm. Friedman, Denver; Maurice H. Harris, New York; Joseph Rauch, Sioux City; Geo. Zepin Cincinnati.

I ask for your suggestions, expecting to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours fraternally,

HY. COHEN,
Chairman.

Seven of the eight above mentioned rabbis replied, and the general sentiment conveyed in their letters is the impracticability of the Bureau. Each congregation is jealous of its autonomy, and interference with local matters will not be welcomed. There will be some difficulty in weeding out undesirables—the Conference itself can scarcely do this. One colleague preferred to discuss the matter with me personally before replying, and another thought that a meeting was essential before a report be handed in. Only two favored such a Bureau; of these one was dubious of its practicability, and the other was enthusiastic. The chairman of this committee believes in the feasibility of the Pulpit Bureau and recommends to the incoming President and Executive Committee, for reasons which to him are obvious, that its formulation be under the chairmanship of the Director of the Department of Synagogue and School Extension, representing the Union of American Congregations.

I have collated some general information regarding this work as practiced by the Evangelical Churches—which in a measure, but only in a

measure—can be of help to us. I have not presented this information with this report because it is meager; and further, I am still awaiting matter on this subject from other religious denominations. It is well here to say that the problem of a Pulpit Bureau such as I, with the assistance and suggestions of the President and Corresponding Secretary of the Conference, have outlined, is the most difficult in all church government.

Respectfully submitted,

HY. COHEN,
Chairman.

Rabbi Philipson—I would ask for an interpretation from the Chair as to the scope and purpose of this committee. I question whether the report, as brought before us, carries out the idea of the Executive Committee.

President Heller—I regret to say that the report shows a complete misunderstanding of the purpose. The idea of the Pulpit Bureau was simply for the guidance of this Conference, to collect information as to the *modus operandi* of older organizations that have had far more experience than we, and to see whether, having studied the methods of other bodies, we might not obtain valuable suggestions for our own guidance.

Rabbi Philipson—In the light of this explanation, it is clear that the committee misunderstood its task. I therefore move you that the report be referred back to the committee, with clearer instructions.

Seconded and carried.

The following Report of the Committee on Social and Religious Union was read by Rabbi Harry Weiss, chairman.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS UNION.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your committee, with the old questionnaires as a basis, eliminated some items, added others, and recast the whole under the captions that comprehend the avenues of approach to unity and the means that make for Jewish solidarity. The Captions were: Intellectual, Religious, Social, Aesthetic and Stranger. The word "Social" was used with absolutely no economic implication, but in its immediate sense of items that make for companionableness with some feature of synagogal activity as a complement. For that reason, we did not touch upon charitable institu-

tions, which are fully recorded in the year book of the Jewish Publication Society. For the same reason, under the heading, Intellectual, we omit from our summary the B'nai B'rith lodges, the Chautauqua and the Council of Jewish Women, whose work is most splendid and helpful to the synagogue. The questionnaire proved an unqualified good, in that it showed in a most tangible fashion, that American Judaism is constructive, that Reform Judaism may truly be styled synthetic and by no means analytical and critical in its concerns, as its opponents would have it to be. Most grateful, too, is the fact, proved beyond question, that our synagogues are absolutely free, as the answers to the question "Do you admit children of non-members to your Sabbath-School?" showed. This for all time settles the charge that Reform synagogues are the homes of the privileged and the exclusive. If children of non-members stay away, it is due to their timidity, but not to our unwillingness to receive them. The same can be said of their elders, who invest their fear with a sense of our aloofness and who construe our urgency to receive them as added proof of our patronizing attitude of mind. Our synagogues are places of public worship. That the stranger is surely welcome is implied in the notices which many congregations place in their local papers, as the answers to the question, "Do you post notices in your local papers?" prove. In Detroit, the unassigned pew system, so its Rabbi says, has made for accessions to the synagogue. The Rabbi of Scranton also approves this method. In the matter of invitation committees to visit hotels, Detroit has proved so successful that praiseful comment has been given it in Jewish papers. The Conference might discuss this matter of the unassigned pew system. At any rate the consensus of opinion is to the effect that a temple is a place of prayer open alike to stranger and to members. We give now the statistics to the following questions under the heading, "Stranger."

STRANGER.

The university reports are very discouraging. But nine answers have reached us. Only Ann Arbor is systematically reached. Others speak of personal acquaintanceship with the students as a means of getting them to the synagogue. We recommend that the Committee on Religious Work in Universities take this matter in hand. The Council of Jewish Women should be urged to reach university girls of our persuasion.

CHILDREN OF NON-MEMBERS.

93 answered yes; 1 answered no; 2, a limited number; 5, if poor; 1, conditional; and 1 for a \$6.00 fee. In the city of the one who answers "no," there is a Sabbath-School institute to care for these children. We recommend that C. C. A. R. cards be reinstituted. The reports thereon

are disappointing. Some do not know what these cards are; others have none; some never received any. In fine, the matter was given no fair test.

WEEKLY NOTICES.

67 have such; 4 on the high holidays; 6 occasionally; 3 in Jewish papers; 1 has weekly postals; 1 has card notices, and 1 speaks of publishing sermons.

HOTELS.

8 have invitation committees of some kind; 3 have the hotel bulletins; 1 has hotel invitations; 1 has a Stranger Committee; 1 on the high holidays; 2 answer "not yet;" 1 intends to; 1 has volunteers for this; 1 has a service card; 1, the Rabbi attends to it, and 1, the Temple Association attends to it. We recommend a system of hotel notices, and particularly the system that obtains in Detroit. It appears to have received wide commendation.

INTELLECTUAL.

81 report libraries; some are very large, as those of Cleveland and Philadelphia. Of this number some are in the process of formation. 33 have some kind of lecture courses but very few have a systematic lecture course; 27 have men's clubs; 47 have women's clubs—the most notable is that of Dr. Stolz, with over 500 members; 52 have youth's clubs, including, of course, post-confirmation, and 38 have children's circles. In this connection we recommend the suggestion of Rabbi Bernstein of St. Joseph, Mo., that all the Jewish youth of the country be organized.

SOCIAL.

The Intellectual and the Social indicate the tendency towards the institutional synagogue as inevitable in large centers of population. Whatever fear there may be that they will secularize the synagogue is more than counterbalanced by the advantage that such institutions offset the club atmosphere with its questionable influences. Again, the institutional synagogue is an expression of the need of housing the multifold activities of the synagogues in large cities.

Have you collation or banquet at yearly congregational meetings? 8 have them; 4 occasionally; 6 intend to have them; 1 has an alumna dinner; 1 a reunion under the Ladies' Aid.

Monthly social vestry gatherings—7 have them and 17 have them at different times.

Confirmation alumna banquets—16 have them; 3 intend to; 1 not yet, and 1, once.

Sabbath-School outings or picnics—75 have them; 7 occasionally; 1 for the post-confirmants, and 2 had them.

AESTHETIC.

We now touch upon the aesthetic features of the synagogue and at once proceed to the crucial items therein, the matter of Jewish song, to which the questionnaire made the following reference: Song and prayerfulness are one. If we wish Jewish song we must have Jewish singers. Jewish song can not but intensify Jewish unity. Unsatisfactory as the situation appears in this matter, we find that the movement for children's choirs and choral societies is steadily fostered. The elimination of non-Jewish choirs must be approached with caution. We feel that this question will solve itself in the following manner: First, and above all, by the introduction of choral societies. This is virtually the situation in Richmond, which, with a choral society of 35, is no longer solely dependent upon a professional quartette. In this city, too, the choral society has made for continuous services throughout the year. We infer the same is true in Buffalo. Their example may well be followed. One of the chief objections, too, to non-Jewish choirs, is the quite frequent conflict of dates between non-Jewish festivals and ours. In such cases non-Jewish singers give their own places of worship preference. Many other objections could be cited. Suffice it to say, the synagogue has the alternative of abandoning all Hebrew song to make it easy for non-Jewish choirs or of giving them Hebrew lessons or of attempting to have its own people sing. The Conference has expressed itself, at all times, in favor of Jewish song. The trouble lies largely in that our congregations expect volunteer service from Jews. We therefore recommend that an annual circular be issued recommending that congregations, wherever possible, secure Jewish singers and pay them. This is one of the crucial points. Congregational singing, which makes for Jewish solidarity, and overcomes the passivity of an audience, will be most easy of attainment, if children's choirs and choral societies be introduced. We believe that the majority of our beautiful Psalms were written by the singing Levites of the Temple. So we will raise up singers in our midst that shall put the ancient spirit to modern adjustment. The Conference, too, can recommend that the Teachers' Schools and Seminaries provide in their curriculum for instruction in music.

STATISTICS.

Altar Guilds—34 have such. In many cases the Ladies' Aid Society does this work. Objection was made to the phrase "Altar Guild" as un-Jewish. The objection is right and the phrase might be changed to "Pulpit Association."

Choral Society—8 have them; 1 had one, and 1 intends to.

Children's Choirs—38 have them.

Evening of Sacred Song—30 have them; 5 occasionally.

Jewish Organist—Only 10 out of 108 replies. 1 has a substitute; 2 have them for Sabbath-School only; 1 intends to get one; 1 had one, and 1 had a Jewish director.

Jewish Singers—238 recorded.

Size of Choir—77 have quartettes; 4 have six; 2 have sixteen; 2 have choral societies of thirty-five; 4 have double quartettes; 1 has nine; 6 have five; 4 have two; 3 have three; 5 have twelve; 1 has ten. All told, from 576 to 585. If from both 238, number of Jewish singers, and 585, number of total singers in all choirs, we subtract the two choral societies, each of 35 and the 5 or 6 children's choirs numbering over 12 each, we will find that the percentage of Jewish singers is very small in our choirs.

RELIGIOUS.

The heading "Religious," brings us to the most momentous features of our report and we at once proceed to what we set in bold relief on the first page of our questionnaire touching synagogal weddings and communal prayer. Regarding the first, the following was said: "Synagogal weddings exalt the rabbinical office, heighten the solemnity of the occasion and make the synagogue the center of the most sacred event in one's life." The questionnaire anticipated a lapse in this regard and was not mistaken, for the reports show that in the North synagogal weddings are few. In the South, there is an inconsiderable number in the larger cities, and not many in the smaller ones. The club and the hotel have usurped the proper function of the synagogue. The atmosphere of both the club and the hotel are not such as to impress the sanctity which a house of prayer puts upon such an occasion. One great purpose is served by synagogue weddings. All friends can attend the ceremony. The principle that a wedding is a private affair is unsound socially and untrue philosophically. We recommend that this Conference advocate simple synagogue weddings.

In the matter of communal prayer, the report is more satisfying. Indeed, the majority introduce such prayers. The prayer seems to be most heartily approved by quite a number who said they would at once introduce it. Only one man objected to it. The prayer is absolutely necessary, for, as the questionnaire put it, when a child, boy or girl, is named, it becomes part and parcel of our religious and social fabric. It is our duty to recognize this by some prayer as the following, incorporated in the larger one, page 99, volume 1, Union Prayer Book: "We thank Thee, O Lord, for the life Thou hast added to our fold. We pray Thee that the child..... prove a blessing to its parents and kin, a credit to our faith and an honor to our citizenship." The questionnaire continues: "We

believe a prayer of this kind makes for parental interest and pride in synagogal worship. This personal element makes for communal solidarity and thus one feels that one is not swept away in the great aggregate of a congregation. Such religious social recognition we must give to our members." We, therefore, recommend the publication of a supplement to page 99, vol. 1, Union Prayer Book, providing for prayers at the naming of a child, for the sick upon entering the temple after recovery, of consolation for the dead, and for a young couple just wedded.

The prayer for a young couple might be: "We invoke Thy blessing upon these two who have entered their new way in life. May peace be within their walls and prosperity within their habitation. May their life be strong with health and firm with faith. May they build the house of Israel according to Thy ancient promises and may they be the keepers of our faith for evermore, Amen."

For the sick this might be said: "Oh Lord, who art a help to the sick and strength to the faint, we know Thou art the source of all life. Within Thy hand is the number of our days. We pray Thee, Almighty Sovereign, to lift anew from the couch of pain our brother in Israel, who has served this community long and well. We supplicate Thee to restore him unto his loved ones in the full possession of his powers that once again they look upon his strength and share the shelter it confers, the hope it inspires and the joy it bestows upon his family, kin and community." We now advert to the yearly records or booklets of communal events such as birth, deaths, marriages, which may well be issued for New Year. The questionnaire says: "You can very easily see how the record of such matters is a direct appeal to your people. If booklets can not be published, a leaflet will do. The chairman has found that such leaflets are kept by many from year to year and serve in the nature of congregational history. The Captions we used were "The Folded Book," "The Passing Year," "They that Entered Life," "The Vow of Faith," "The Oath of Union," "The Immortal Gate," corresponding to "Births, Confirmants, Marriages, Deaths." In lieu of this, some read annual reports from the pulpits, evidently incorporated in New Year's sermons. Such reports, however, have no permanent value because the congregation at large can neither keep them nor refer to them when occasion demands. Very few, save the largest congregations, issue annuals. We recommend the issuance of such pamphlets.

We now touch upon another matter of which the questionnaire did not treat. Do your constituents close their places of business on New Year and the Day of Attonement? Reform Judaism never countenanced laxity in the observance of these days or for that matter of the other holidays. It is time that the Conference take a definite stand upon this question.

We believe that the Conference should advise the annulment of the recess on the Day of Attonement though many report no interval between

morning and afternoon services. Furthermore, the Conference may advise its constituents to accentuate the matter of fasting as an item of soulful discipline and culture of the will which Reform Judaism has never by the remotest implication set aside. The Theology of the Union Prayer Book is in accord with this and a pronouncement on our part would eliminate doubt and make for unity. Some, on the Day of Attonement, hold children's services during the intermission. Dr. Stolz has children's services at 9 o'clock before the regular services. Richmond has its choral society to render music during that time.

Coming to the matter of the Passover, the questionnaire purposely evaded the matter of Congregational Seders and put the question "Do you insist on home Seder?" Despite this question many answered that they have congregational Seders. The Seder is essentially a home affair. The philosophy of the congregational Seder is merely an expression of homelessness. It is evident that two things can not exist side by side for the same purpose. One is bound to eliminate the other. This is an absolute surety in accord with the physical axiom, that two things can not hold the same time nor the same space and yet remain two. We recommend that this Conference disapprove of congregational Seders and also that the children of the Sabbath-School be trained in every particular of the Passover. The question, too, "Do you urge the invitation of friends and relatives to Seder?" was most favorably answered, for, indeed, the feast is one of hospitality and it is well to enforce this idea. Here, too, the Conference could correct aright some common misapprehensions. The Union Prayer Book emphasizes the sanctity of the first and last days. Children generally attend school even on these days. Our reform has been in the recasting of the Union Hagada, in setting aside the eighth day, and in eliminating the second night Seder. The Conference should assert that the beauty of this festival must be maintained, and that, as a means of discipline, the eating of unleavened bread throughout the week is urged as a ceremonial, easy of accomplishment, fitting as a memorial and useful as a means of schooling the will. In the matter of Shabuoth the same is true. The day is holy and all business should cease thereon. We urge that the Conference disapprove the dissociation of the confirmation ceremonial from this day. The same principles apply to the observance of Succoth. This holiday, by reason of its inherent beauty, is keen with life. The blessings of the field exercise a wizardry which none can hope to dispel. Our life is knit to the things of earth. The palm, myrtle, citron and willow, have yet their hold upon us. It were well in the subsequent questionnaire to ask how many as yet use these symbols. As we touch upon the Sabbath we reach the climax of our religious situation. It comprehends the substance of our ritual and through its wonderful power accentuates the unity of Israel, throughout the world. It is most delightful to note from the reports, that the Kiddush ceremony, and the kindling of lights, have

yet a hold in all synagogues. It is no exaggeration to say that the Sabbath has kept Israel alive. It is the point of fixity in the mutations of Israel's career. It was a social feast. It was a religious feast. It was a communal feast. It combined joy with its solemnity, prayer with thought and rest with the hope of larger work. The stranger and the native were one.

Sabbath Leagues—No concerted action for the rehabilitation of the Sabbath exists among our people. Certainly for the rehabilitation of the Sabbath, concerted effort is necessary. We recommend (1) that this great work commence with the Rabbis themselves. If the Rabbis do their correspondence of a Saturday, permit their relatives to attend theatre of a Saturday, take their trips on that day, take money and exchange money on that day, our people will not hesitate to shop on that day despite preaching to the contrary. (2) The children should be formed into Sabbath observance leagues. (3) The Council of Jewish Women should by resolution be commended in their stand for the Sabbath and urged to continue these activities. (4) The Conference should recommend the experiment of the five work-day week and gather statistics to ascertain whether the losses entailed are considerable. Lawyers, wholesalers and bankers at this very time have half holidays on that day, so the possibility of having a whole day for the Sabbath admits of being carried into effect. It were well, too, that the Conference recommend that when synagogues are built, contractors should not exact work upon that day. (5) The New York Sabbath Association has a bureau to secure work for such as wish to observe the Sabbath. We recommend that the Conference issue a circular urging that the wishes of those who are content with the five work-day week should be regarded by Jewish employers. (6) The idea of the day should be intensified both as a means of memory by deepening the line of cleavage between it and other days, by a simple ceremonial which children love. Children love light. As the flowers turn toward the sun, the moths toward the candle and the birds toward the things brilliant, as the sea-gulls beat against the light-houses, so the lure of light is upon all things. We recommend the service of the seven wicks and the sweet spices. Children love fragrance. It is a symbol of spirituality. It were well to have six wicks clustering together representing the six days. A little blessing could be said at the close of the Sabbath day, to this effect: "We thank Thee, Lord, for the Sabbath now gone. Even as these wicks are grouped together, so the days of the week are grouped for the Sabbath. May the coming week find us strong for work, even as this Sabbath has given us the blessing of rest and of Spiritual light. May our lives radiate good even as these spices distil fragrance." (7) In the matter of the Sabbath, we recommend that the Conference send circulars advising the institution of Friday eve services with lectures where none exist. (8) We

recommend that the Conference inaugurate a systematic campaign for such Sabbath observance.

Purim and Chanukkah are brimming with life and we may omit mention of them, beyond the fact that in connection with the latter, in addition to the giving of candles, the custom of some, to add candelabra be followed.

Rosh Hashonah—To the question "Do you issue pamphlets of year's events, births, deaths, marriages, confirmants?" 10 answer yes; 3 intend to; 2 have annual reports; 2 monthly bulletins, and 2 occasionally publish such annual pamphlets.

Yom Kippur—To the question "Have you children's services during interval between morning and afternoon services?" 14 answer yes, 2 intend to.

Pesach—"Do you insist on home Seder?" 73 answer yes; 24 have congregational Seders and 2 have the confirmants at their home Seders. "Do you urge from pulpit the invitation of friends and relatives to Seder?" 57 do so occasionally; 1 answers "when relevant."

Shabuoth—"Have you congregation reception?" 10 report yes; 1 styles it a good idea; 1 has an alumni reception, and 1 receives the confirmants at home.

"Do you give confirmants Bibles, Prayer Books or what?" 44 do so; 1 occasionally; 1 gives Kohler's Guide, and 1 a class book.

Succoth—"Have you Congregational Booth?" 57 have; 1 had; 2 have it occasionally; 2 intend.

"Do you decorate altar?" 72 do; 2 occasionally, and 1 has a harvest service.

Sabbath—"Have you Sabbath League?" Only 7 out of 108 answer yes. "Have you tried to revive Kiddush and lights in the home?" 67 answered yes; 1 occasionally; 1 not yet.

Purim—92 have some manner of celebration; 1 an oratorio.

Hannukkah—"Do you give your children candles?" 47 do so; 22 have some manner of celebration, and 1 intends to. Some give the children candelabra as well as candles.

Weddings—"Have you synagogal weddings?" 20 report yes; 49 seldom or occasional; 1 intends to; 1 when desired. Of these, quite a number add very seldom.

Children—"Do you mention in communal prayer children when named or initiated into Israel's fold?" 59 do so; 3 had it; 2 will adopt it; 8 do so when requested and 1 has the prayer only for girls.

Totals—109 replies; 10 letters without answers, 7 empties; total 126. Congregations reporting represent 17,933 members.

Rabbi Rappaport suggests the exchange of pulpits as a means of social and religious solidarity among the Rabbis. Your committee recommends this.

Your committee is grateful for the result attained by this questionnaire, whose success is built up on those of others sent out in previous years. Each member of the Conference is thanked for the items of interest he has contributed. The total shows: first, that Reform Judaism is keenly alive to every situation, whether cultural, religious, or social, and that the portals of its synagogues are writ large with welcome to all. The second inspiring impression won from these questionnaires was, that its leaders are hereulean workers. "No smith at his forge, no laborer at his trench, no business man at his desk, toils harder for the interest of others than the Reform Rabbi." Casting up the sum of things we find that the founder of the Conference built beyond his anticipations and that we are knit unto one another as brother unto brother in a work that sanctifies all alike, whatever be our station and that the lamp of the Law is carried with unwavering hand to those who grope in the darkness and seek a way to the lasting truths of Israel.

HARRY WEISS, *Chairman*,
JOS. JASIN,
JULIUS RAPPAPORT,
ABRAHAM RHINE,
E. W. LEIPZIGER.

Rabbi Morgenstern—We have certainly had an admirable report, rich in suggestions. This report deserves most careful consideration. I feel, though, that because of a certain obscurity of presentation and recommendation, it would be well, in order that the Conference might discuss this report intelligently, to refer it first to a special committee for definite formulation of the recommendations. I offer that as a motion.

Rabbi Kohler—In seconding this motion, I would say that I commend the spirit that permeates the report. It means that we are constructive, and want to build up a positive Judaism. In some matters, however, the report is a little impractical. There is, for example, a certain Puritan un-Jewish spirit expressed with reference to the Sabbath. For this reason I second the motion.

Rabbi Franklin—I think that we all fully agree with the commendable spirit that moved the writers of this report. However, I think that that very spirit has made them overzealous. If this report is referred to a committee for more definite framing of the recommendations, that committee should be instructed in one certain particular, namely, that this Conference has never stood for

interference with the internal affairs of any individual congregation or congregations. I therefore offer as an amendment, that this committee be instructed to ignore, or to report adversely upon any recommendations which touch upon the internal administration of individual congregations.

Rabbi Harris—I second this amendment, in order to oppose it. I think that we anticipate the work of that committee. Presumably the committee will decide what is appropriate and what is not. The discussion on Rabbi Franklin's amendment will really lead to a discussion of the merits of the report. We want to avoid that. For that reason, I hope that the amendment which I am seconding, will not pass.

Rabbi Foster—There are a number of recommendations in this report that are really covered by reports of other committees. If they are to be considered, they ought to be referred to such committees, and considered in connection with their reports. I therefore suggest that Rabbi Franklin incorporate in his amendment that such recommendations be referred to the proper committees.

Rabbi Franklin—I will add that to my amendment.

Rabbi Philipson—This report covers a very wide range. It takes in almost everything that any Jewish body can consider. It contains a large number of definite recommendations. Therefore, without discussing the merits of the paper, although I wish to add my meed of recognition to the splendid labor of this committee, I offer as a substitute motion, that this committee which is to be appointed shall, as its mode of procedure, take up the definite recommendations of this report and recommend action thereon to the Conference.

Seconded and carried.

The Report of the Committee on Certificate of Conversion was then presented by its chairman, Rabbi David Philipson.

Rabbi Philipson—I would like to make a preliminary statement in order that the status of this matter may be perfectly understood. You will remember that in the discussion at the New York Conference there were two parties, one wishing that this whole matter of proselytism be re-opened, and the other saying that we

want only a clearer certificate of conversion. According to the decision of the Conference at that time, the latter party was sustained, and the committee which was appointed understood it was simply to work out a certificate of conversion that could be printed as a Conference document, and could be signed by the Rabbi who received the convert into the faith, and signed also by the convert. The certificate has been drawn up in this form.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

FORMULA OF CONVERSION.

To All Whom These Presents May Concern, GREETING:

.....of.....
 having come before me.....a rabbi in Israel
 on.....56, with the expressed desire of joining
 the Jewish community, and having declared.....belief in the prin-
 ciples of Judaism, a satisfactory knowledge of which I have found.....
 to possess, I.....with the sanction of the two associates,
 whose names are appended hereto, have formally received the said
into the Jewish faith.

.....
 Rabbi Congregation.....

Said.....on.....part herewith
 makes declaration of.....purpose:

(a) To worship the one God and none besides Him.

“Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one.”

(b) To govern.....life in its acts of commission and omission by the
 religious and moral principles developed in Israel from the days of
 Moses and the prophets to this time.

“Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all
 thy soul, and with all thy might.”

“He that hath told thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord
 requires of thee, to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with
 thy God.”

(c) To affiliate.....actively with the work of Judaism as
 represented by the congregation.

“The law which Moses commanded unto us is the inheritance of the
 congregation of Jacob.”

- (d) To adhere faithfully to the belief in the mission of Israel, as the priest-people that has been appointed to witness unto God everywhere, and to work for the coming of the day when the Lord shall be one and His name One.

I also wish to state that the President of the Conference, as a member ex-officio of the committee to whom this work was assigned, felt that in the phrase "with the sanction of the two associates" the word "two" should be omitted. With his permission I will state his reason. He tells me that he has many conversions, and it has been his custom to receive the converts in the presence of a Minyan, and in accordance with the custom he would like the word "two" left out, so that he could have the formula signed by himself and the ten members that constitute the Minyan.

Rabbi Messing—I want to make one suggestion. The committee, to my mind, has left out one thing that seems very important. When we take one into our faith he should tell us what will become of his children, and should promise that if there be issue that they will belong to us.

Rabbi Philipson—This idea was not embodied simply for the reason that he is making a declaration for himself, and it is to be supposed that if a man becomes a convert to Judaism, he will raise his children in the Jewish faith.

Moved and seconded that the report be received.

Rabbi Deutsch—I would ask the chairman of the committee to state the points in which his certificate differs from the one of 1896, at the Milwaukee Conference.

Rabbi Philipson—The formula accepted at the Milwaukee Conference finally, is a formula of six printed pages. What was wanted was a certificate of conversion. Now this old formula opens with a long list of questions. We did not believe they should be included in the certificate, but should go into the minister's handbook. The ceremony, the part the minister should take preliminary to giving the certificate, should also be in the minister's handbook. Then comes the declaration of the acceptance of the Jewish faith. The four principles are given here. They are very much like the original statement, though simplified. The

committee did not feel it necessary to give a list of God's attributes. We have accordingly prepared a simple declaration.

Rabbi Kohler—I wish to add to what Rabbi Philipson has said, that, in answer to Rabbi Deutsch's question it should be also stated that in the former certificate "two additional Rabbis" were required as witnesses. In the certificate here presented the words "Rabbi and two associates" are used, thereby permitting laymen to serve as witnesses. This is distinctly in accord with tradition.

Rabbi Weiss—Does that new form contain any mention of, or does it eliminate the principle previously incorporated in regard to reward and punishment?

President Heller—It omits all reference to it.

Rabbi Weiss—I amend that this very important item which is expressive of our faith be inserted.

Rabbi Kohler—I support the amendment for the sake of discussing it. As Rabbi Philipson has said, in regard to the immortality of the soul and reward and punishment, there is absolutely no difference between the Christian, or the Mohammedan faith and our own. On the other hand, if we embody a theological question it would be far more logical to accentuate the fact which is implied in the preceding paragraph of the older formula, in which the idea of the God-son-ship of all men is brought out, as against the God-son-ship of one man or one son of God. That would be far more logical. But I do not think it necessary to embody this theological element in such a certificate.

Rabbi Stolz—Before we vote on a matter of this kind we ought to be sure we understand everything correctly, both the changes made, and the omissions, and why. In the original draft the intention was not only to show what the convert believed, but also what he ceased to believe. Now, we should decide whether the new certificate should follow the same lines. In the second place, we want to know just exactly what is meant by the convert's promise to affiliate actively in the work of the congregation.

Rabbi Kohler—I have always held that the Torah, as we have it, was not in its entirety, written by Moses. Whatever there is of Mosaic origin is simply incorporated; the rest is developed. At

the same time I do believe, and would ever believe that we stand upon Torath Moshe, upon the Law as it has been formulated in the various writings of the Scripture. When Isaiah speaks of *I'thorah v'lith u'dah*, he certainly means a Torah. In other words, the prophet as well as the priest had a Torah, and we stand upon Torath Moshe. When Dr. Philipson showed me his formula, there was simply the ethical and not the religious law presented—that the proselyte pledges himself to live in accordance with the ethical law. I wanted also to emphasize the idea that we are not simply prophetic Jews, who believe in proselytism, but that we stand upon the Law, and we believe in Torah Moshe, and that the whole congregation of Jacob lives in its spirit and is identified with its historical development.

Rabbi Goldenson—This subject is much too important to be disposed of in a hurried discussion and by wholesale adoption. We ought to divide it up into its various sections. There is now a difference of opinion. I was surprised when I heard the chairman of the committee state the principle of the selection of distinctive Jewish beliefs. I will not discuss the principle at present, but I think it ought to be discussed by us generally, and then having determined the principle we ought to test each one of these statements with reference to the general principle adopted. I believe we ought to postpone right now this discussion to a definite time, when every one of the members of the Conference can be present and dispose of this matter properly.

Rabbi Deutsch—I amend that the certificate be printed and distributed, the discussion of it be made the special business for tomorrow. Then everybody would have had a day in which to study it carefully and eventually be able to offer amendments, if he think fit.

The substitute was seconded and carried.

The Conference adjourned until 3.30 p. m.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Convention was called to order at 3.30 p. m. with President Heller in the chair.

The following Report of the Arbitration Committee was presented by Rabbi Jos. Stolz, chairman.

REPORT OF THE ARBITRATION COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Arbitration begs leave to report that not a single case was referred to us for arbitration. This may signify that during the year a perfectly harmonious relationship has existed between all of our members and their congregations, or that little confidence was placed in the power or ability of your committee to adjust delicate difficulties, or that one or both parties were unaware of the existence of a Committee on Arbitration. Since the latter may have been the case, we recommend that in the next circular sent out to the congregations and members, reference be made to the existence of the Committee on Arbitration as one of the Standing Committees of the Conference.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

TOBIAS SCHANFARBER.

The committee was thanked and the report adopted.

Rabbi Leo M. Franklin, chairman, presented the following Report of the Lyceum Bureau.

REPORT OF THE LYCEUM BUREAU.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on the Lyceum Bureau begs leave to report as follows:

When, some three years ago, the suggestion was made by the chairman of this committee that a Lyceum Bureau of Jewish lectures be established under the direction of this Conference, it was with the profound conviction that such an institution would serve as a most efficient means of bringing the message of Judaism to a great many men and women who otherwise would not have heard it. In the three years that have elapsed since then, this conviction as to the possibilities of the Bureau has only been deepened, despite the fact that the actual tangible results achieved have been comparatively meagre. The truth is that the influence of the Bureau seems to have been rather indirect than direct, for while the number of speakers sent out into the field has been comparatively few, the number of courses of lectures on Jewish subjects instituted throughout the country, directly due to the suggestions offered by the Lyceum Bureau have been very many. Instance after instance might be cited where miscellaneous and often objectionable entertainments have been substituted, through the work of this Bureau, by lectures on Jewish subjects by men

authorized by reason of their ability and earnestness to speak for the Jew and Judaism.

In former reports of this committee, the reasons for the comparative meagreness of direct results have been given at length. Among these especially has been the unwillingness of many communities to make the necessary sacrifice in paying a proper lecture fee for men whom the Bureau might send them. The second reason to which attention has been called—and I note this with sincere regret—has been the absence of the spirit of real sacrifice on the part of some of our colleagues to give either their time or their effort without rather liberal compensation for their services. This, it should be said in all justice, does not by any means apply to all of our colleagues, but it does to many of them. Some have failed or declined to register with the Bureau, claiming that they could not give the time, nor would they give the effort necessary to help the cause. They who most are deserving of criticism, however, are the men in the ministry who, having registered with the Bureau, go to the various communities for which the Bureau has arranged lecture courses, utterly ignoring the existence of the Bureau and thus depriving it of the credit it should have. Of this, we have had frequent examples this year as well as heretofore.

But this committee can plead a special reason for being unable to show more tangible results this season than in previous years. In the first place, due to the fact that the Conference did not convene last year until November, the committee did not receive its appointment until late in January, and it was well nigh the first of March before the prospectus could be sent to congregations and rabbis throughout the country. By that time, practically all of the congregations had made their arrangements for their season's work, and it was impossible for them to avail themselves of the benefits offered by the Bureau. Nevertheless, inquiries have been received from fourteen cities since the issuance of the prospectus, and a number of lectures have actually been delivered under the auspices of the Bureau.

By resolution of the last Conference, a fee of one dollar has been charged those registering with the Bureau, to cover the expenses of postage, printing and advertising. In addition to this, the Executive Board of the Conference put at the disposal of the committee the sum of fifty dollars to meet legitimate expenses. I am pleased to report that although the committee did not draw any of the amount thus voted to it by the Executive Board, there remains in the hands of the chairman at this time the sum of thirteen dollars and forty-five cents (\$13.45), all expenses having been met by the registration fees collected. A detailed financial statement is appended to this report. In several instances colleagues reported their inability to pay the registration fee, in which case it was remitted, but one of the colleagues who objected on principle to the paying of the fee on the ground that it made the Conference too much of a business insti-

tution, was, after consultation with the president of the Conference, informed that the chairman had no right to remit his fee and his name therefore did not appear on the prospectus. I make this explanation in order that there may be no misapprehension as to the attitude of the committee in matters of this kind.

So much for the work of the committee up to this time.

In order that the influence of the Bureau hereafter may be somewhat more direct, it is the purpose of your committee to change its methods to a considerable degree. To this end it is purposed to substitute for the prospectus advertising which has been practically our sole means of publicity heretofore, frequent notices in the Jewish press, both of a display character and as reading matter. In this way, the work of the Bureau will be brought to the attention of a larger number of people than by means of the prospectus, and in the end will be but little more expensive. However, special circularizing will be done in various localities, this being made necessary by a new plan of work which your committee proposes to establish. It is our idea to establish lecture courses in circuits, by addressing various neighborhood communities, offering them the services of a given number of individual lecturers at a stated price. In this way, we shall, we believe, be able to make engagements for several evenings in a week for those registering with our Bureau without entailing any very considerable traveling expense upon the lecturer or upon the community that may engage their services. As the matter of expense has been the principal obstacle to success in the past, this will make the whole plan more feasible. We shall address these communities in regard to the specific men whom we shall offer them, and we have little doubt that the plan will show very much more satisfactory results.

We recommend, therefore:

(a) That the new plan of work thus outlined be sanctioned by the Conference.

(b) We recommend that the plan inaugurated last year of extending the benefits of the Bureau to prominent and scholarly Jews who are not members of the Conference be continued and extended.

(c) Whereas, much good can undoubtedly be accomplished by spreading the message of the Jew and of Judaism not only among Jews, but as well among non-Jews, your committee asks for authority to arrange for similar lecture courses, by men registered with this Bureau, with non-Jewish institutions, as for instance Y. M. C. A.s and other church organizations.

(d) Inasmuch as the last prospectus was issued very late in the season, we recommend that no registration fee be charged this year to those who were registered with the Bureau during the past year.

(e) Your committee asks that such sums of money as are now in its possession, together with such further sums as may be collected for registration fees, as well as the amount voted by the Executive Board for last

year's work and not used (together with an equal amount to be made available this year), be put at the disposal of this committee for the purpose of carrying on its work.

As the efficiency of the committee's work depends very largely upon its getting under way at the very beginning of the season's activities, we ask that this report be disposed of promptly, and the funds requested be at least in part made immediately available.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

LEO. M. FRANKLIN, *Chairman*,
EUGENE MANNHEIMER,
I. AARON,
SOL. KORY.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF LYCEUM BUREAU FOR 1910.

Registration Fees received\$55.00

Expenditures.

Jan. 20,	Stamps	\$ 5.00	
	Circular Letters	2.25	
	Registration Cards	1.50	
	Postals	1.75	
	Stamps	3.00	
	Stamps	1.00	
	Stamps	2.00	
		<hr/>	\$16.50
Feb. 21,	Maple Press	\$20.50	
Feb. 23,	Stamps55	
		<hr/>	\$21.05
Mar. 1,	Adv. in "Israelite"	\$ 2.00	
	Adv. in "Jewish Exponent"	2.00	
		<hr/>	\$ 4.00
	Total Expenditure	<hr/>	\$41.55
			<hr/>
	Balance		\$13.45

On motion, the report was received, the recommendations were taken up seriatim, and adopted.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

Rabbi Harris—Will the chairman kindly let us know what success the Bureau has had so far? The report does not seem to give us such information.

Rabbi Franklin—The Bureau has had more success than can be estimated directly. To illustrate, there was in my own state a city that was accustomed to give under Jewish auspices all sorts of entertainments. They gave minstrel shows, whist parties, and other things and called them Jewish entertainments. Directly due to the fact that our Bureau sent out its prospectus this last year and the year previous, that congregation, which by the way, has no resident Rabbi, decided by resolution to do away with entertainments of that kind, and to substitute for them lectures by Rabbis, and as a result this year they have had three such lectures. That is in Bay City. Saginaw has exactly the same plan now in contemplation. There are a number of communities that corresponded with the chairman of the committee in regard to their lecture course. Although we did not complete the arrangements to the extent of really sending the men under our own auspices, they did take the very men about whom they corresponded with us. Since the issuance of our last prospectus, fourteen cities have communicated with us. That does not include a number of cities that wrote to us perhaps a single letter asking for information. It simply refers to cities where something tangible was done, but not under our direction. Most of these letters come from the smaller cities, although some of them have come from the larger communities.

The Chair announced the following committees:

On President's Message—Jos. Stolz, Wm. Friedman, M. J. Gries, M. Harris, S. Hecht, K. Kohler, A. J. Messing, S. Schulman, A. Simon, T. Schanfarber, Geo. Zepin.

On Resolutions—D. Lefkowitz, F. Cohn, S. Deinard, S. Kory, D. Marx, M. Lovitch, I. Rypins, L. Witt.

On Audit—G. Zepin, M. Feuerlicht, I. Marcuson, M. Newfield.

Memorial Resolutions—I. Aaron, D. Alexander, J. Blatt, G. Deutsch, L. Gross, A. J. Messing, Jr., J. Mielziner, L. Volmer, H. Wolf.

Nominations—L. Franklin, A. Brill, H. Ettelson, W. Fine-shriber, S. Goldenson, A. Guttmacher, M. Raisin, N. Stern.

Press—I. Landman, E. Frisch, I. Klein, L. Rothstein.

Special Committee on Recommendations of Publication Committee—D. Philipson, M. Harris, D. Lefkowitz, T. Schanfarber, J. Stolz, J. Morgenstern.

Special Committee on Report of "Social and Religious Union"—M. Harris, K. Kohler, L. Franklin, J. Kornfeld, S. Foster, Wm. Fineshriber, A. J. Messing, Sr.

Thanks—S. Hecht, D. Alexander, M. Messing, L. Witt.

In the absence of its chairman, Rabbi Sam'l Hirschberg, the Corresponding Secretary read the following.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SERMONIC LITERATURE.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

DEAR COLLEAGUES: Your Committee on Sermonic Literature present with this, their report for this Twentieth Convention of the Conference.

Following the practice of previous years, requests were sent to members of the Conference, giving preference to those who had not as yet made any contribution to the publication, asking for sermons for the Holiday Pamphlet. At this time four sermons are in hand, two for Rosh Hashannah and the same number for Yom Kippur, leaving a Neilah and Shabbos Shuvah Sermon still to be received. These have been faithfully promised, however, so your committee can give every assurance that the pamphlets will be printed and distributed in ample season to serve the purpose for which they are intended.

The sermons thus far received are the following: Rosh Hashannah Eve, "Memory and Hope," Rabbi Harry Weiss. Rosh Hashannah Morning, "The Experiences of Life," Rabbi M. Friedlander. Kol Nidre, "Perfection, An Ever Enlarging Ideal," Rabbi Jacob H. Kaplan. Yom Kippur Morning, "The Choice," Rabbi Charles A. Rubenstein.

Our colleague, Rabbi George Zepin, director of the Department of Synagogue Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, has offered the services of his department in distributing the sermon pamphlet, thus reaching a wider clientele than we otherwise could; in fact, bringing the literature to just the communities which it has been our special desire to serve at the holiday season with the appropriate devotional discourses. Your committee would recommend that the Conference accept this offer of Rabbi Zepin, and authorize them to deliver to him as many copies of the holiday pamphlet as he may deem requisite for distribution through his department.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL HIRSCHBERG, *Chairman.*

It was moved and seconded to receive this report.

Rabbi Morgenstern—There is one matter requiring consideration here. The Publication Committee has presented a recommendation overlapping this report in part, which will have to be considered by a special committee. There is on hand a large number of sermons from last year. The Publication Committee recommends that we publish no sermons this year. That recommendation should be considered in connection with this. Furthermore, before we can adopt this report it would be well to get from Rabbi Zepin some idea of the number of sermons we will have to print this year and the expense that will be entailed upon the Conference.

Rabbi Zepin—The plan I suggest is this: To send out a double postal to a mailing list I have of fifteen hundred names, and be guided by the returns. There is ample time to find out how many pamphlets will be needed; if we have more requests than copies left over from last year, the problem then will be to either reprint last year's booklet or to get out a new set.

Rabbi Philipson—It seems to me this co-operation would be a splendid thing. I move that this report be referred to the committee that has in charge the recommendation of the Publication Committee, to consider and bring in some report in reference thereto.

This motion was seconded and carried.

Rabbi Moses J. Gries, Treasurer, presented the following list of contributions made to the Alliance Israelite Universelle in honor of its jubilee celebration.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ALLIANCE ISRAELITE UNIVERSELLE.

1910.

Apr. 2,	Max C. Currick, Congregation Ashe Chesed, Erie, Pa...	\$ 14.25
	Harry Levi, Congregation Leshem Shomayim, Wheeling, W. Va.	22.00
	E. Ellenger, Congregation Beth Israel, San Diego, Cal...	12.00
Apr. 5,	C. Young, Sec'y EmekBeracha Lodge No. 61, I. O. O. B., Ft. Wayne, Ind.	10.00
	David Marx, Congregation Gemilath Chesed, Atlanta, Ga.	37.00
Apr. 6,	David L. Liknaitz, Congregation B'nai Jeshurum, Leaven- worth, Kan.	13.10

	Jacob Singer, Congregation Beth Israel, York, Pa.....	15.50
Apr. 15,	Julius Adler, Treas. Congregation Israel, Amsterdam, N. Y.	5.00
Apr. 27,	Israel Klein, Congregation Zion of West Chicago, Chi- cago, Ill.	10.00
	Moise Bergman, Congregation Gates of Prayer, New Or- leans, La.	20.00
	Max Heller, Congregation Temple Sinai, New Orleans, La.	148.90
Apr. 29,	Jos. S. Kornfeld, Congregation Bene Israel, Columbus, O.	10.00
	M. M. Feuerlicht, Religious School of Indianapolis, He- brew Congregat'n and Purim Service, Indianapolis, Ind.	25.00
	Jewish Federation of Indianapolis, Ind.	25.00
May 6,	Leo Kaminsky, Sec'y Indianapolis Lodge No. 58, I. O. O. B., Indianapolis, Ind.	10.00
July 23,	A. B. Seelenfreund, Sec'y Isiah Temple, Chicago, Ill.....	85.74
Total		\$463.49

Rabbi Nathan Stern, chairman of the Committee on Synagogal Music, read the following report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SYNAGOGAL MUSIC.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your Committee on Synagogal Music beg leave to report that progress in revising the Union Hymnal has been necessarily slow. The committee shares the opinion so often expressed at meetings of this Conference and elsewhere that it is eminently desirable to have the new hymnal out at the earliest possible moment. The Conference can not with good grace continue to offer for use in Synagogue and School the volume it has so repeatedly and openly condemned. However, the many difficulties in the work of revision, and the limited number among our colleagues who are both willing and able to lend assistance render progress decidedly slow. Moreover, all criticism in the past has been more or less destructive and has been purely preparatory. The more arduous task of construction is now possible and must henceforth be done.

During the three or four months since the present committee has been formed, it has endeavored to give effect to some of the recommendations submitted in the elaborate and carefully planned report last November at New York. To this end a circular letter dated April 5, 1910, was addressed to the members of this Conference with the view to collect information and material that might serve as a basis for immediate and for future work. Some thirty replies were received and, in so far as they evidenced a spirit of interest and willingness, were very encouraging.

Many of the respondents pleaded unfamiliarity with music and with hymnology. The committee desire to call the attention of their colleagues to the fact that the immediate issue is not the music, but rather the obtaining of suitable hymn texts. The life of the rabbi is surely not so barren that in a service of from one to twenty-five years some religious lyrics shall not have been stored away in the recesses of memory, or in the more reliable compartments of filing apparatus. For these, the committee make a special plea. We note with regret that many of the committee have not even responded to the circular letter. Coleridge is credited with the remark that Luther did as much for the Reformation by his hymns as by his translation of the Bible. The members of this Conference will well serve their respective communities by co-operating with the committee in the work at hand and so hastening the publication of the contemplated volume. At least, in the gathering of appropriate lyrics all of us can and ought to help. And it must be borne in mind that no thought of musical adaptations may be entertained until the words therefor are well in hand.

It is advisable to say a word or two as to the nature of the lyrics sought. Above all, they must be religious and Jewish. The object which should never be lost sight of is that the complexion of the hymnal, and every part thereof, shall be truly Jewish. Each selection shall throb with Jewish sentiment and be in accord with Jewish thought. A mere change of wording, so frequently indulged in to harmonize the context with our doctrines, should not be encouraged. When showing merit, compositions by Jews shall receive preference. Furthermore, all hymns should be good poetry and commend themselves as such. They should be neither didactic nor over-prayerful. Our propensity is to be cumbersome and didactic. "The sermon should preach, the prayer pray, and the hymn sing." Simplicity, dignity, warmth, lyric qualities, and pure emotion shall be the canons of choice. Nor shall the selections be too long. Two or three stanzas shall be sufficient, and every sentence should preferably end with every verse so that words may readily be set to musical phrasing.

So much for generalizations.

In the report of last year's music committee mention was made that, of the one hundred and seventeen hymns in the Union Hymnal, the word texts of thirty-four were good. Though not referred to by numbers in that report, they are Nos. 2, 3, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 33, 36, 49, 61, 66, 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 87, 90, 92, 95, 97, 102, 103, 105, 107, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116. These will serve as a nucleus for the new hymnal. It seems but just that every hymn that has been printed in both parts I and II of the Union Prayer Book should, for that very reason, find place in the new hymnal. The Adon Olam, the Yigdal, the En Kelohenu, the Yaaleh, in Hebrew and with the English version of the prayer book, and the numbers now used in the Union Haggadah should be included. To these we

would add hymns Nos. 5, 10 (?), 13, 24, 31, 41, 42, 54, 68, 69, 95 of the present Hymnal; 142 of Gottheil's Hymnal, which is a version of Psalm 92; and the songs published in a small but well-selected volume of 36 numbers by the Rev. Dr. F. de Sola Mendes (New York, 1887), who, as a member of this committee, gladly puts the volume at our service. We note with pleasure that Mr. Charles Bloch has expressed his willingness to extend to the Conference the right to make use of the hymns and melodies in his Jewish Hymnal, edited by Henry L. Gideon. No. 46 therein "Father, see thy suppliant children," an excellent confirmation hymn by Felix Adler, should, by all means, be used. Hymns for the Sabbath-School found at the end of the present hymnal are worth reprinting, and as suggested in last year's report, should find place in the body of the hymnal. The handy translations from the Hebrew by Nina Davis entitled, "Songs of the Exile," published by the Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1901, contains some very fine material, especially Jehudah ha Levi's "Song of the Oppressed," p. 51; "Longing," p. 52; "Loved of my Soul," p. 61; Solomon ibn Gabirol's "Morning Song," p. 29; for Kol Nidre, though from the prayers for Hoshanah Rabba, Isaac Ben Samuel's "Hymn of Refuge," p. 71; and for Yom Kippur, several numbers may be culled from Baruch ben Samuel's "I am the Suppliant," beginning with "Pardon, I pray Thee, our iniquity," p. 76. Permission to use these would be a condition precedent. Arrangement might also be made with Rutledge & Co. to appropriate verses from their "Festival Prayers in English," as well as with the publishers of Alice Lucas, "The Jewish Year," and "Talmudic Legends, Hymns and Paraphrases." In the last-named volume "Almighty God, who hearest prayer," p. 35, and "Morning Hymn," p. 33, strike a good note and are suggestive.

The spirit of many of the old Jewish prayers and *Piutim* would, if properly translated in English, lend itself admirably to increase the distinctively Jewish character that we want to see in the new hymnal. It would be well, therefore, to consider the advisability of naming on future hymnal committees, at least, one member well versed in the productions of the medieval and modern Jewish poets. The committee should be responsible to see that the selections submitted were fittingly Englished.

We also re-endorse the recommendation of last year to include in the revised hymnal some children's services for use in school or otherwise, and to provide that the music of the Hebrew responses shall all be in the same key.

The problem of obtaining good musical settings promises to be a comparatively simple one. Mr. Max Spicker, musical director of the Temple Emmanuel, New York, who is an authority among musicians, and whose opinion we may value, recommends the following numbers in the Union Hymnal as good music and worthy of further use: Hymns Nos. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, second tune, 24, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, both

tunes, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, second tune, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, together with the patriotic numbers and the hymnals for the Sabbath-School at the end of the Union Hymnal.

In addition, the Association of American Cantors, through its president, Dr. Herman L. Martin, has requested to be invited to participate in the work of revision.

We recommend that:

1. Hereafter no one shall be appointed to this committee unless he first consent to share the burden of the work.
2. At least, one member of the committee shall be versed in the medieval and modern Jewish poetry.
3. Without again being addressed on this subject, the members of the Conference shall voluntarily submit appropriate religious lyrics to the committee.
4. This Conference shall favorably consider the offer of the Cantors' Association, and shall instruct its committee on Synagogal Music for the ensuing year to make arrangements with the Cantors' Association.
5. This Conference shall vote the sum of five hundred dollars to be placed at the disposal of its music committee.

A committee on revision of hymnal has been appointed consecutively for several years, each incorporating the best of the preceding reports, aided by instruction of the Conference. Is it not time now for the Conference to appoint a committee with power to present next year not a report, but a hymnal?

Respectfully submitted,

NATHAN STERN, *Chairman*,
 MAURICE H. HARRIS,
 DAVID MARX,
 LOUIS D. GROSS,
 JACOB SINGER,
 F. DE SOLA MENDES.

President Heller—I wish to state that a great deal has occurred during the year, of which the Conference has no knowledge. Rabbi Stern took up this work under serious difficulties. It was work that had been advanced to a forward point by our present Corresponding Secretary, but owing to the burdensome duties of his office, he could not continue it. It is a matter of congratulation for us that Rabbi Stern was willing to take up this work on such short notice and devote as much time and attention to it, as he has, as evidenced from the report.

The report was received and the recommendations taken up serially. Recommendations I and II were adopted. Recommendation III was read.

Rabbi Harris—I move that the Secretary send an appeal to the Rabbis and the Jewish press, for suitable hymn texts.

Rabbi Gries—I wish to second this motion. There are many musicians in this country who have a real taste for verse, and who make far better contributions than the members of this Conference. I have had a recent experience with reference to this. I wanted some special verses and asked for contributions from my own community, and received, to my surprise, some very excellent verses. I have no doubt that if such an invitation be extended to the country at large some very excellent verses would be received.

Rabbi Stolz—Just before leaving for the Conference, a member of my congregation who is very much interested in Jewish music asked me to inform the Conference that Dr. Leopold Stein has produced most exquisite religious poetry. Probably there are some here who could translate this poetry into the English language.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I fear that the chairman of the committee is doomed to disappointment and will realize that very few contributions will come in spontaneously. This committee will have to go to work in different ways to secure proper contributions. They will have to write many letters. Of course, some people will gladly contribute, but a very large number of people will need constant urging.

Rabbi Marx—I think I can speak somewhat out of the fullness of experience as to the difficulty of receiving answers to communications even from members of the Conference. This is a very difficult work. I would suggest to the Conference not to hamper the work of this committee by making too many suggestions as to what to embody and what not to embody. If your committee is efficient it will understand this. As to versification, it is not an easy thing to take a psalm and cast it into good verse. We have a number of psalm renditions in the present hymnal. When you sing them, and when you read them, you are simply compelled to ask what do they mean. Some have the subject after the predicate in

such a way as to obscure the meaning. A number of them have a hopelessly involved structure.

In regard to circularizing the public generally I heartily agree with what has been said. I fear our chairman is a little optimistic. That is why he is chairman. He knows as well as I do that it is a most difficult proposition to get in this material. Now what the committee wants is a liberal interpretation of the program which it outlines. It has a definite basis; the definite basis was already given last year; the program submitted then, suggested an outline. Last year, we could not revise the hymnal; we had to do destructive work. After all this hymnal must come back to the Conference, and the Conference will be able to pass upon it when the book as a hymnal is recommended to the Conference.

Rabbi Zepin—I would like to say a word on the subject of the hymnal, in so far as it touches Sabbath-School work. Allowing for all the wisdom of former committees, and without reflection upon the present committee, after hearing the most splendid report, I think the needs of the small communities should be considered. I represent the small communities. I believe that the majority of the present hymns are not appropriate for the smaller Sabbath-Schools, because they are not written in the correct key. I think the committee should take into consideration that there are in the smaller communities only a few who can sing a part placed before them. It is all right in the large cities where you have choral societies and choirs.

The motion was put and carried.

Recommendation IV was then read. After a lengthy and thorough discussion the following amendment, offered by Rabbi Harris, was adopted:

The Committee on Synagogal Music is authorized to enter into arrangements with competent individuals, cantors and other musicians.

The fifth recommendation was read and referred to the Finance Committee. The report as amended was adopted and the chairman of the committee thanked.

Rabbi G. Deutsch, chairman, presented the Report of the Committee on Contemporaneous History.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Jewish Library of Jerusalem, known as Midrash Abarbanel, sent out an appeal for support. This library is one of the richest in the world, and situated in the historic center of Judaism, has a claim on the sympathy of all Jews. It further is of great importance for the intellectual life in the Holy City.

I. Be it therefore resolved, that the Conference request its members to send their own publications and those of others who will donate a copy for this purpose to the Midrash Abarbanel and assist this noble work by active interest.

II. The Hebrew Dictionary of Ben Jehuda is the first attempt to give us a much needed repertory of the Hebrew language in the whole course of its historic development. The first volume has already appeared. For another volume the noble philanthropist, Jacob Moser, of Bradford, has promised to defray the expenses. Your committee recommends that efforts be made to raise a subscription of \$2,000 to defray the cost of one volume and that at all events six copies be purchased and placed in the library of the Hebrew Union College.

III. Your committee further recommends that we continue our subscription to Eisenstein's Hebrew Encyclopedia and buy ten copies of the Midrash Rabba, edited by J. Theodor, and place the same in the library of the Hebrew Union College.

IV. Your committee begs to bring to your attention once more the fact that numerous donors to Palestinian charities will be grateful for advice and direction. The old system of "Halukah" has, with the increase of the population of Palestine, proved so ineffective that even its most ardent supporters are forced to abandon it. On the other hand, the need of caring for the dependant and for the economic and intellectual elevation of the large population has a just claim upon the Jews in lands of prosperity. Even those who deny this claim can not conceal from themselves the fact that donations for Palestinian institutions are constantly solicited and granted. Occasionally Schnorrers establish nominal institutions as a disguise for begging schemes. The donors are looking for advice and are entitled to it. Your committee therefore reiterates its recommendation to have a list of deserving institutions drawn up after careful investigation and to publish it for the guidance of the public.

V. The condition of our unfortunate brethren in Russia has not improved. The hope which might have been legitimately entertained five years ago that the government of the Czar would at least to a certain degree by slow steps ameliorate the terrible lot of our brethren in the Empire can no more be entertained. Unless unforeseen changes occur in the political situation, the fate of the six millions of Jews in Russia will

continue to be a source of the gravest concern. It is rather humiliating to think that in 1745, when the Jews of Bohemia were threatened with expulsion, England and Holland vigorously interceded on their behalf, while in the twentieth century the measures hitherto taken, were of a strictly Platonic nature. Be it therefore resolved that this Conference request its members to set aside one day, preferably Shabbath Zachor, for a sermon and special prayer on the condition of the Jews in lands of oppression; that the press be requested to give to the event the necessary publicity and to publish a syllabus of the most telling facts, showing the barbarities from which the Jews are suffering, and that the various representative bodies take all the necessary steps, leading to intervention, as was so often done in Turkey on behalf of the Armenians and the Greeks.

VI. It might also be of great value, if the members of this Conference were to urge the members of their congregations and their friends who go to Europe and provide themselves with passports, to demand a vise from the Russian consul and in each case in which this vise is denied, lodge complaints with the Department of State and invoke the aid of the congressmen and senators of their State.

VII. In the death of Professor Charles Gross of Harvard University, the cause of Jewish history in this country lost a valued co-worker. The Jew in this country is still by large masses regarded as a newcomer who only reaps where others have sown. It is of great importance to show that he had even in the days when his settlements were few and far between, contributed more than his share to the upbuilding of this glorious commonwealth. We therefore owe a debt of gratitude to those who have labored in bringing these facts to light. Among them the late Professor Gross occupies a prominent rank. Be it therefore resolved that this Conference record its grief at the untimely death of this scholar and convey these sentiments to the family of the deceased.

VIII. Wilhelm Bacher, dean of the Budapest Rabbinical Seminary, celebrated the sixtieth anniversary of his birth on the twelfth of January, 1910. His numerous disciples and admirers paid him the tribute of love and gratitude on this occasion. The Hungarian Government bestowed on him a high decoration. It is but proper that this Conference shall not remain behind, for Wilhelm Bacher has by his vast erudition and facile pen enriched the field of Jewish literature in all its branches, and by his works on the Haggadah established a claim on the gratitude of Jewish preachers. He also has, as one of the editors of "The Jewish Encyclopedia" acquired a special claim on recognition by American Jewish theologians.

Be it therefore resolved, that this Conference express its best wishes to Professor Bacher, assuring him of the warmest sympathy of all the members of this body and of their hope that he be spared for many years to come to Judaism and its literature.

The celebration of centenaries of prominent Jewish teachers and leaders by this Conference began with that of Zechariah Frankel in 1901 and since that time we had such an event almost every year, the climax being that of last year, when the date of the Convention was fixed by the centenary of David Einhorn. Though recognizing that this practice may be overdone, your committee feels that three notable events of this order which are imminent in this and the next year ought not to be passed by in silence.

IX. On November 3, 1910, the centenary of the birth of Leopold Stein will occur. Leopold Stein was a leader in the Reform movement, active in the now historic conferences in the forties of the last century, the second of which was held in Frankfurt, A. M., while he was rabbi there, the first liberal rabbi in that historic community and stronghold of orthodoxy. Of all liberal rabbis of his age he stood nearest to the American ideas, and the congregation which he formed after the retirement from his position in Frankfurt was even called the American synagog. Stein has further, as an author and particularly as a poet, a claim on lasting remembrance. Your committee therefore recommends that the members of this Conference be requested to celebrate by a sermon on the preceding Sabbath or by a lecture at an appropriate day, the hundredth anniversary of this teacher in Israel.

X. Two other notable centenaries will occur in 1911, that of Leopold Loew on May 22, and that of Ludwig Philippson, on December 28. Leopold Loew was next to Geiger the greatest systematic theologian of the nineteenth century. His vast erudition and his graceful style gave to the Reform movement great force and lasting impetus. As member of the synod held at Leipsic and as champion of the liberal cause at the Hungarian "Congress," 1868-1869, he won for himself a historic position in the work of Reform Judaism.

XI. Ludwig Philippson was the great organizer of Jewish forces in their adaptation to the exigencies which the changed political and social conditions of the nineteenth century created for Israel, then slowly emerging from the physical and the intellectual ghetto. To him in a great measure the establishment of rabbinical conferences, the foundation of rabbinical seminaries, the creation of publication societies and the development of the Jewish periodical press are due.

Your committee recommends that the anniversaries of these two great teachers be commemorated by appropriate papers at the next Convention.

Respectfully submitted,

G. DEUTSCH,

M. N. A. COHEN,

H. W. ETTELSON,

Committee.

On motion, the report was received and the recommendations were taken up seriatim.

Recommendations I, II, III, V, and VI, were referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Recommendations VII and VIII were adopted.

Recommendations IX, X, and XI were referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation IV having been acted upon before, was not considered.

Rabbi Deutsch—There is one important event of contemporaneous history that escaped me. I learned of it only this morning, therefore had not time to embody it in this report. I now present it for your consideration. Last Saturday was the seventieth anniversary of one of our nestors, I hardly need mention his name. I refer to Rabbi Dr. A. J. Messing.

On motion, the Conference expressed its sentiments of honor and congratulation to Dr. Messing by a unanimous rising vote.

An oral report on Responsa was then made by Professor Deutsch, and received with thanks.

The session then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

The meeting was called to order at 8.30 p. m. After expressing the pleasure and honor felt by the Conference in having in its midst the essayist of the evening, President Heller introduced Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, who read a paper on "The Liberal Movement in English Jewry." (Appendix C.)

A rising vote of thanks was given Mr. Montefiore at the conclusion of his paper.

President Heller then informed Mr. Montefiore of the action taken by the Executive Committee in electing him an Honorary Member of the Conference. This action was ratified, unanimously, by a rising vote of the Conference.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Executive Committee was instructed to print in separate form the paper of the evening.

Mr. Montefiore cheerfully agreed to bear the Conference's mes-

sage of co-operation, congratulation and God-speed to our brethren across the sea.

After the reading of announcements, the meeting was adjourned.

THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 30, 1910.

The Convention was opened by President Heller. Prayer was offered by Rabbi Solomon Kory.

The minutes of the proceedings of the previous day were read by Secretary Morgenstern.

Greetings and an invitation to attend the meetings of the Independent Order B'nai Brith Dist. No. 6, were received from Mr. A. B. Seelenfreund, Secretary.

President Heller was authorized to convey in person the greetings of the Conference.

Rabbi Gries, chairman of the Committee on Religious Education, presented the following report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Religious Education has labored under the combined difficulties of the lateness of the 1909 Conference, of the consequent tardy appointment of the new Religious Education Committee, and the still longer delay of the Year Book.

In 1909 your committee presented to the Conference a general outline of work, which it hoped to accomplish in the course of succeeding years. The New York Conference of 1909 approved the general recommendations of the committee and the committee is endeavoring to carry the recommendation into effect.

In accordance with the action of the Conference, setting aside a day for Religious Education, a tentative program for that day was duly submitted to the Executive Committee.

The sub-committee, to which was referred the preparation and submission of an outline of lessons for Confirmation Classes, requests further time.

Some new publications of interest to Rabbis and school superintendents, are presented for inspection in this year's exhibit. The Sabbath-School transfer card is herewith submitted for approval. See Appendix A. No effort has been made to take a general Jewish census, nor to secure a general report concerning the methods of Jewish schools throughout the coun-

try. It has been deemed wise that we should not attempt any independent effort along these lines at the present time. The committee preferred to await the organization of the proposed Jewish Educational Board, within whose province this work would lie. The sub-committee appointed to arrange for the reprint of illustrations from the Jewish Encyclopedia and other publications, which should be of value for the teaching of Jewish history, has not yet made its report.

The programs for the year 1909 and for 1910 have had the definite purpose of making clear the present status of the conditions existing in our Jewish Religious Schools. With this thought in mind, all the available text books have been reviewed—the courses of study have been analyzed—a paper on school organization has been presented and every effort has been made, both by papers and through the discussion, to reveal to ourselves our schools as they are.

It is very important that we, as the leaders in Jewish Religious Education, appreciate to the fullest our obligation to every Jewish community and to all the children. Therefore, it is necessary that as soon as possible a complete study should be made concerning the extent of Jewish education, and especially concerning the lack thereof in the large Jewish centers and in all the scattered communities throughout the land.

Influential organizations, local and State and National, are endeavoring to introduce religious instruction into the public schools of America. Many appeals are being sounded on behalf of moral education in the public schools. We believe that religious instruction in any form, even bearing another name, is beyond the province and contrary to the spirit of the public school system of this country. All the more important is it, therefore, that our own religious schools should be far more efficient in the work which they do, far more inclusive in the work attempted, and, especially that our Jewish Religious Education should be so thoroughly organized that we should offer the benefits thereof to every Jewish child in the land.

The committee recommends:

First—That the Central Conference of American Rabbis co-operate as fully as possible with the Teachers' College, with the Jewish Chautauqua Society, with the Synagogue and School Extension Board, with the National Council of Jewish Women, and with the proposed Jewish Educational Board, and that your committee be empowered to endeavor to establish effective co-operation with the above named organizations, in the interest of the development of Jewish Religious Schools and the larger cause of Jewish education.

Second—That the committee be empowered, on behalf of the Conference, to co-operate in the name of the Conference with the State Associations of Religious School Teachers and Rabbis. (State organizations have now been formed in Arkansas, Mississippi and Ohio.)

Third—That the Conference approve the idea of a Correspondence School for Sabbath-School teachers, and the establishment of correspondence study courses for pupils who can not attend an organized religious school; and that the Conference lend its support to whichever agency—Teachers' College, Synagogue and School Extension Board, or Chautauqua Society—will offer a plan that seems practical and gives promise of success.

Your committee respectfully requests helpful criticism and suggestions from all the members of the Conference, in order that both through the program and the work of the committee, it may more nearly meet the needs of all.

EXHIBIT REPORT.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

Your Committee on Religious Education begs leave to report that the resolutions of the committee presented to the New York Conference of 1909, and by it approved, have been carried into effect during this working year. The thanks of the Conference have been properly expressed to the publishers of religious school books and material who have co-operated with us, both by gifts and by loans, in carrying forward our exhibit plans.

The beginning has been made of a permanent Religious and School Exhibit. A large part of this year's exhibit is the permanent property of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Requests for the loan of last year's exhibit came from Arkansas and Mississippi. A part of the present permanent exhibit was sent to Mississippi for its convention of Jewish teachers and Rabbis. Ohio wanted the exhibit, but it was not ready. There seems to be a growing appreciation of the value of the exhibit to all those interested in the active work of the Jewish school.

The exhibit of this year includes text books appropriate for Jewish Religious School use—also maps and material of interest both to teacher and to pupil—also books showing new methods of instruction now being introduced in schools not Jewish, but which methods are applicable to our own schools. There is a special exhibit of handwork which may be done by the pupil. This method is being successfully employed in many non-Jewish schools of the country.

The exhibit also includes a few new books of interest to Rabbis, especially some volumes recently published by our honored guest, Mr. Claude Montefiore.

The committee desires to report that it did not expend any part of the \$150 appropriated for its use toward the purchase of a permanent exhibit. It asks, however, for a renewal of the appropriation.

The committee recommends:

First—That the Conference express thanks to the Jewish Religious Edu-

cation Association of Ohio, for the donation of its exhibit collection to the Conference.

Second—That the committee be instructed to express the appreciation of the Conference to the publishers and to any others who by gifts or loans may co-operate in the furtherance of the work of the committee.

The committee presents a motion picture exhibit of the Life of Moses, of Samson and of Esther and Mordecai. Like exhibits have been given in some of our schools, upon the occasion of Chanukkah and Purim entertainments and upon some special occasions, for the purpose of instruction and entertainment. It is reported that the exhibitions have been welcomed by the children with much enthusiasm.

The thanks of the Conference are due to the National Vaudette Film Co., of Detroit, for their generous co-operation in making our motion picture exhibit possible.

Thanks are also due to Rev. Milton S. Littlefield for a loan of samples of hand work and of his book, "Hand-Work in the Sunday-School."

The committee recommends the preparation and publication of a list of books of special Jewish interest, suitable for the Jewish School Library. Also the preparation and publication of a list of books suitable for a Jewish Teachers' Reference Library.

Also, that the committee be empowered, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, to publish a descriptive catalogue of the Conference Religious School exhibit, with a brief description of the loan collection.

The committee respectfully recommends the earnest co-operation of all the members of the Conference toward the development of both the permanent and the loan exhibit. The committee desires to learn concerning new methods being used in individual schools and wishes to receive papers which have been written, maps which have been drawn and models which have been made by the pupils.

The committee feels that it is necessary that we should search for and secure the very best material available for religious instruction, and that information concerning it should be put within the reach of every school, student and teacher.

MOSES J. GRIES, *Chairman.*

Rabbi Gries—In presenting the report of the Exhibit, I desire to say that this year no effort was made to have a large loan exhibit; rather the intention was to make the beginning only of the permanent collection which was to be the property of the Conference, for the use of the Conference, and for the different State associations, and for individual schools in accordance with the plan adopted last year.

On motion, the report was received and taken up seriatim.

The first recommendation was read.

Rabbi Philipson—I move that the paragraph be adopted as read, with the modification that the entering into definite relations with the new Educational Board be deferred until a communication be received by the Executive Committee, clearly setting forth its purposes, and that the Executive Committee be given power to act thereon. Seconded and carried.

The second and third recommendations were adopted.

The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh recommendations of the "Exhibit Report" were adopted.

The report as amended was adopted as a whole.

As chairman of the Committee on Religious Education, Rabbi Gries then took the chair.

Rabbi Jos. Stolz presented an address on Post Biblical Histories (see Appendix K).

The discussion was led by Rabbi G. Deutsch (see Appendix L).

Rabbi Isaac Landman then read a paper on School Organization (see Appendix J).

Upon invitation of the chairman, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore continued the discussion (see Appendix M).

Rabbi Kohler—I move a vote of thanks to our dear friend and colleague for the address just given us, so full of interest, information and suggestion.

Seconded and carried unanimously.

Adjournment was then taken.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

The Convention was called to order by President Heller, and proceeded at once to the consideration of the question of the Certificate of Conversion.

Rabbi Harris—Your Committee on Ministers' Hand Book, as part of its report, already has a certificate of conversion that would have been brought in, in its place when that committee reports. But inasmuch as you are now considering the certificate of conversion, would it not be in order for this certificate to be read here so

that the Conference may have the privilege of yet another alternative? Your committee has endeavored to draw a form briefer than the old one, and I think more comprehensive than the one presented at this Convention.

I offer this certificate as a substitute:

This is to Certify

that

.....
 having carefully studied the principles, doctrines and institutions of the Jewish Religion, was received into the fold of Israel at.....own express wish and desire, after renouncing the religion in which..... had been reared, after solemnly declaring.....full belief in the tenets of Judaism and after faithfully promising to remain true to its principles and to live and die in its Faith.

Signature of Officiating Rabbi

.....
 Signature of Witnesses

.....
 Signature of Convert

The adoption of the substitute was seconded.

Rabbi Kohler—I wish to ask Dr. Harris how many associates or witnesses he proposes?

Rabbi Harris—Two associates.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I rise to a point of order. We might expedite matters, if we realize that one problem only concerns us in the discussion of these two formulas. The great difference between the two certificates is the fact that the one offered by Dr. Harris contains no declaration of principles, and the other does. It would expedite matters if we confine ourselves for the present to a discussion of whether we want a certificate containing a declaration of principles or not.

(Rabbi Stolz in the Chair.)

President Heller—I should like to say to the Conference that the way it proposes to deal with the certificate which has been offered by the committee is altogether different from the way in which we have hitherto dealt with similar things. It has always

been considered that anything so official ought to be considered with sufficient care, to begin with, to be sure of avoiding any mistake. Furthermore, it ought not to be decided by the members in attendance without first having been submitted to all the members of our body. Time and again in the history of this Conference there have come before it formulas and expressions of all sorts, and particularly whenever these expressions approach anywhere the appearance of a formulation of creed, it has always been fair to the membership of this Conference that such a formula be submitted to the examination, criticism and correction of the entire membership. In suggesting this, I submit, without wishing to hurt its feelings, that the committee has exceeded its power. It was asked to prepare a certificate by which a conversion should be attested and recorded. Now it seems to me an altogether unusual thing that a mere attestation of that kind should contain a written declaration of belief. Just as little as, when we give a marriage certificate, we embody in that certificate any promise to honor, cherish or obey, so in this instance we should simply certify to the fact of what has taken place. Accordingly by omitting the declaration of belief we obtain what is sought. Returning to my first argument, I can not escape the strong conviction that we in a measure are wronging the membership of this Conference by not submitting to them this formula before adopting it, and that we would be acting with insufficient deliberation, if we simply, after having looked at the copy here, adopted it in a sparsely attended session, and upon such short consideration.

Rabbi Philipson—As chairman of the committee, I feel that I must make a reply to the statement which has just been made. My own feeling was exactly what Rabbi Heller has stated, and when I began to work upon this some time ago, my idea was to write out this formula of attestation of the conversion. From the proceedings of the last Conference, it seemed that the committee was instructed to take the certificate which had been adopted at Milwaukee, and revise it. We found in that certificate this statement of principle. I did not feel that the committee was empowered to interpret the action of the New York convention in the way

I felt it should be done. Had it been my own personal interpretation of a certificate of conversion, I should never have written out a certificate such as appears in the Milwaukee Year Book, or as we have here. But I did exactly what has been stated here, and what Dr. Harris has done in his way. And I should be very glad to have an interpretation of the Conference on that point.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I offer a substitute motion that we prepare in the proper way a certificate, merely attesting the act of conversion. Said certificate to contain no statement of the principles of Judaism. Seconded and carried.

(President Heller in the Chair.)

Rabbi Philipson—Inasmuch as the certificate prepared by the Committee on Ministers' Handbook has been offered, there is only one thing to do, if it is to be considered at all, and that is to refer it to the Committee on the Certificate of Conversion, and for this committee, to which Dr. Harris be added, to consider both certificates, and then bring in a final report some time to-morrow. I would so move. Seconded.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I believe it is in order in discussing this question to offer from the floor further suggestions as to the contents of this certificate. I would suggest that the certificate should consist of two parts, one part to be filed, after proper signature, by the Rabbi who officiates at the conversion, and one part to be held by the person converted. I offer that as a suggestion to the committee.

The motion was then put and carried.

After full discussion of the papers of the morning, Rabbi Gries presiding, the Conference adjourned.

THURSDAY EVENING.

A Round Table discussion of "The Workingman and the Synagogue" was led by Rabbi Sol. Foster and participated in by the Conference at large.

FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 1, 1910.

The Convention was called to order by President Heller. The opening prayer was delivered by Rabbi Jos. Blatt.

The minutes of the preceding session were read by the Corresponding Secretary, and approved.

President Heller—I should like to say just a few words, that we may better realize the significance and purpose of the exercises we are about to begin. It is well that we should, at this Convention, celebrate a Geiger Day. Whether the Memorial Volume which has been contemplated for years shall be published or not, of course will rest with this Convention. It is certainly desirable, that there be some memorial, if it be found practicable to have one. I feel that American Judaism would be poorer, and that, in a way, it would be even a loss to Catholic Judaism, if there were not a Central Conference to render homage to the memory of this great German. All of us, more or less, have, around the 24th of May last, dedicated one or the other service to the memory of this great man to whom every one of us and our congregations are indebted. Yet, few of these sermons were published as a permanent contribution to the knowledge of the life of this great man. It is therefore fitting that we, American Reform Rabbis, devote one day of this Convention to the memory of Abraham Geiger. It is most appropriate that the exercises be introduced by the report of the Committee on the Geiger Centenary.

The chairman of the Geiger Centennial Committee, Dr. Kohler, made the following statement:

When last year the work of the Geiger Memorial Volume was mapped out, it was understood that each member of the committee would have his contribution ready for print by the end of February so that the work could be published in time for the Geiger Centennial. Soon after February and partly before this, the chairman of your committee learned, to his great regret, that the articles promised had not been written; that the biography of Abraham Geiger which had been assigned to Rev. Dr. E. G. Hirsch, and which was to form the most prominent part of the work, would not be written by him at all, and that Rev. Dr. S. Sale, another pupil of Abraham Geiger, had resigned as a member of the Central Rabbinical Conference, and was, therefore, not expected to hand in his

article. The announcement of Ludwig Geiger's work—"Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk," which had appeared since, caused others to either postpone or cancel their contributions. In view of the facts the chairman of your committee, finding it impossible to make good the promise virtually made last year by his committee, felt compelled to tender to the Executive Committee his resignation, as he could not face the responsibility that would rest solely upon him as the original mover of the plan and in his capacity as chairman. The Executive Committee having accepted the resignation, it remains for the Conference to ratify it and to discharge the committee.

In order, however, to pay due homage to the father of Reform Judaism on this day devoted to Abraham Geiger's memory, Dr. Kohler remarked that he had suggested to the Executive Committee that Dr. Philipson, who had prepared an article on Abraham Geiger as Reformer, should be requested to read the same; and that he would read from Ludwig Geiger's work, which had reached him in time before starting for the Conference, a remarkable letter written by Abraham Geiger to his seventeen-year-old son, Ludwig, when informed that he would, or could not follow his own career as rabbi. The Conference would, said Dr. Kohler, be still more imbued with the spirit and the idealism of Abraham Geiger, when listening to the very gem among the literary treasures he left to us.

The report of Dr. Kohler was referred to the Committee on President's Message.

Rabbi J. S. Raisin then read a paper on "The Reform Movement before Geiger" (see Appendix D).

Rabbi David Philipson read a paper on "Geiger, the Reformer" (see Appendix E).

Rabbi K. Kohler read in German a letter from Abraham Geiger to his son Ludwig.

Rabbi Max Landsberg's paper "The Reform Movement after Geiger," was then read (see Appendix F), and discussed by Rabbi A. Guttmacher (see Appendix F, close).

FRIDAY EVENING.

Services were held in the pavilion of The Inn. Rabbi Max Raisin read the prayers. The Conference sermon was preached by Rabbi Wm. Fineshriber (see Appendix H).

Rabbi Stern acted as director of music and Mrs. David Lefkowitz rendered a solo.

The closing prayer and benediction were spoken by Rabbi A. J. Messing, Sr.

SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 2, 1910.

Services began at 10.30 o'clock. Rabbi Isaac Marcuson read the prayers. Rabbi Louis Witt read the Torah and Haftarah. Rabbi Isaac L. Rypins delivered the Conference Lecture (see Appendix I). Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber spoke the concluding prayer and benediction.

SUNDAY MORNING, JULY 3, 1910.

The Convention was opened by Rabbi Max. Heller, President.

Prayer was offered by Rabbi Harry W. Ettelson:

The minutes of the previous meeting were read.

A communication from the Secretary of the Jewish Chautauqua was received, and the fraternal greetings of the Conference were ordered sent in reply.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AND
RELIGIOUS UNION.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The committee desires to bear testimony to the industry and zeal shown in this report. In fact, the enthusiasm of the committee carries it beyond the domain of the subject assigned. Its province is—social activities connected with the Synagogue distinct from the pulpit and the ritual. With great regret, therefore, our committee is unable to touch upon many excellent suggestions in the paper. Summed up, they could be defined as "recommendations for religious revival." It is a suggestion for some future conference.

I. To consider its proposals on the question of bringing Jewish students at universities, under the influence of the Synagogue, we recommend that it be referred to the Committee on Religious Work in Universities.

II. Inasmuch as the C. C. A. R. cards have never been discontinued, the recommendation of the committee that they be reinstituted is superfluous.

III. We recommend the adoption of the suggestion that congregations issue invitations to visitors in the hotels of their respective communities,

and that the form used in Temple Beth El of Detroit be published herewith as a model.

IV. The recommendation to organize the forces of the Jewish youth in this country is too indefinite to be carried into effect at this time.

V. We recommend that the proposition to print the statistics compiled by the committee in the preparation of their report be referred to the Executive Committee.

VI. We recommend the adoption of the suggestion that our congregations employ Jewish singers in their choirs, wherever possible.

VII. We recommend the adoption of the suggestion that the teachers, schools and seminaries be asked to incorporate in their curricula, the study of Jewish music.

VIII. We recommend synagogue weddings wherever possible.

IX. The recommendation relating to the introduction of special prayers should be referred to the Committee on Minister's Hand Book.

X. We endorse the recommendation concerning the publication by our congregations of year books or leaflets, setting forth the leading events of the congregation's activities during the year.

XI. We encourage the congregational Seder in so far as it may educate the people in conducting such service in their homes; but it is by no means to be fostered to the degree of discouraging or of supplanting the domestic Seder service.

XII. We recommend that the incorporation of the questionnaire in the Year Book be referred to the Executive Committee.

M. HARRIS, *Chairman*,

K. KOHLER,

LEO. FRANKLIN,

J. S. KORNFELD,

WM. FINESHRIBER,

A. J. MESSING,

SOL. FOSTER.

The report was received, adopted seriatim and as a whole.

The Report of the Auditing Committee was then read by its chairman, Rabbi Zepin, and on motion, was received and taken up seriatim.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Auditing Committee begs leave to report that it has carefully examined the financial statements contained in the several reports submitted to this committee and finds them correct.

We have before us the recommendations of the Finance Committee, which are briefly summarized as follows: The income of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, consisting of dues and receipts from sales of publications is equally divided between the Relief Fund and the General Expense Fund. The Relief Fund consisting of \$19,339.66, produces interest amounting to more than twice as much as we need at the present time for purposes of relief. This will not always be the case, a larger fund is needed. The General Fund, at the present time, \$5,001.95, is being gradually depleted, because the expenses each year are larger than the income of each year. For the last three years this difference between the annual income and annual expenditure has been paid out of the General Fund. In the course of a few years we will probably have no General Fund left to supply these annual deficiencies. The Financial Committee, therefore, recommends that the following change be made in the distribution of the income of the Conference: One-half of the dues and one-half of the interest shall still be placed to the credit of the Relief Fund, but the income from publications which usually has been divided between the Relief Fund and the General Fund should henceforth be apportioned altogether to the General Fund. This recommendation your committee concurs in.

We desire to commend the practice of the Treasurer in securing the services of the Guardian Savings & Trust Company of Cleveland to act as his bookkeeper. An admirable set of books have been opened and kept. Your committee has very carefully examined the recommendations submitted by the Treasurer for the improvement of business methods and the safe-guarding of the moneys and securities of the Conference. It herewith submits these recommendations with its concurrence.

First—Resolved, That the Treasurer be instructed to make immediate transfer of all books of record, of moneys, and all securities, properly endorsed, to the new Treasurer, immediately following his election.

Second—Resolved, That the Executive Committee shall designate the banks in which the moneys and securities of the Conference shall be deposited.

Third—Resolved, That the moneys of the Conference shall be deposited, and all certificates, stocks, bonds, and securities, shall be registered in the name of the Conference.

Fourth—Resolved, That the securities shall be deposited in a safety deposit box as designated by the Executive Committee, which box shall be opened only in the presence of the Treasurer and a deputy appointed by the President.

Fifth—Resolved, That the Treasurer's Report shall be presented to the Conference after having been fully audited by expert accountants designated by the Executive Committee, for which auditing the Executive Committee are hereby authorized to make the necessary expenditure.

Sixth—Resolved, That the Treasurer shall furnish a bond in an approved surety company, said surety bond to be paid for by the Conference.

Seventh—Resolved, That the fiscal year shall end June 10th. This change is recommended in order that the books may be properly closed, and a full financial statement duly audited may be presented to the Conference, and thus be published in the Year Book.

Eighth—Resolved, That the Conference adopt a folded voucher check, instead of the present form of check. This change is recommended in order that the original bills for payment may be attached to the folded voucher check, or if there are no original bills, for payment and description of the services rendered; but the nature of the payment should be embodied in this voucher check, together with the address of the payee. This would improve the records, and make it possible to check every bill properly.

Ninth—Resolved, That the Recording Secretary shall furnish to the Corresponding Secretary and the Treasurer the names and addresses of new members elected, and that such names shall not appear in the Year Book until the Treasurer shall have notified the Corresponding Secretary that the first payment of dues has been properly received.

Respectfully submitted,

M. M. FEUERLICHT,
GEORGE ZEPIN,
M. NEWFIELD,
I. E. MARCUSON.

The first recommendation was read.

Rabbi Stolz—It appears to me that this recommendation is very short-sighted. It happens that last year our expenditures for pensions were smaller than they have been for a number of years past, perhaps, for the last ten or fifteen years. The committee loses sight of the fact that our membership is growing older each year, and according to the laws of nature we will in a very short time be called upon to spend much larger sums than we have heretofore. But aside from all this, their procedure is wrong. The constitution provides that one-half of all net profits shall be placed to the credit of the relief fund. The only way this could be carried out would be to ask for an amendment to the constitution which must be held over until next year.

Rabbi Marx—Rabbi Stolz is not interpreting the constitution; that is a by-law.

Rabbi Guttmacher—The last speaker has voiced my sentiments.

It has been the established policy of this Conference to set aside one-half of the profits from our publications for the relief fund. It is true that while the expense of publications is drawn altogether from our general fund, and the profits accruing from publications are divided between the two funds, nevertheless, I think we ought to adhere to this policy. It is far better that the general fund run low from time to time, because we will then be more economical. We must look after our members, and I therefore strongly oppose the recommendation of the committee.

Rabbi Newfield—I understand that the Conference has been running behind almost every year; that the expenditures have increased. It is true we could possibly be more economical, but it would hamper us very much, and I believe in the steady progress of our work. It does not mean, if you adopt the recommendations of this committee and of the Finance Committee who suggested it, that you have to make this a permanent feature. It is merely a temporary expedient. If within the next two or three years we find we can go back to the old method, it can be changed again at any meeting.

Rabbi Stolz—Why is it necessary to take measures now when we have five thousand dollars in the General Fund?

Rabbi Marx—For the information of Rabbi Stolz I may say that although five thousand dollars appear in this report, we have actually not so much because we have not considered in this report outstanding liabilities. After these liabilities shall have been paid we shall have \$3,312 in this fund.

Rabbi Newfield—Unless we take some steps now nothing can be done to change this system until a year from now, and possibly by that time you will have to borrow money.

Rabbi Schulman—I feel very keenly the force of the argument of Rabbi Stolz and Rabbi Guttmacher. I am opposed to this change. If the Conference has been incurring expenses beyond its income, then it must change its policy. Knowing human nature as you all do, the mere fact of passing this motion certainly will not imbue this Conference with the spirit of economy; it will go ahead and commit itself to further schemes of expending money.

I am opposed to the passing of this resolution, if it leave the impression that we have departed from the wise provision of the by-laws. Should the Conference find itself in difficulty in the course of the next year then it will borrow from the Relief Fund, and there will be a moral responsibility to repay to the Relief Fund as soon as possible.

Rabbi Marx—As chairman of the Committee on Finance, and one who has been considering this matter for two years, I wish to take issue with the suggestion made by Drs. Stolz and Guttmacher. I agree with Dr. Schulman to this extent, that this Conference has gone perhaps beyond its province in regard to this fund, but I also say that this Conference has also gone beyond its province in regard to the Relief Fund. The question is whether the Relief Fund is the main work of the Conference, or whether the necessary work of the Conference is maintained by the General Fund. It is well to tell the committees to cut down expenses, but how do this? Every committee this year has been hampered because of insufficient funds to carry on its legitimate work. It is a very, very serious matter. Your General Fund has been continually decreasing. In 1907 there were \$4608 in the General Fund. After we shall have paid the bills of this Conference we shall have about \$3312. At this rate, in about seven years you will have no Conference. We can not afford to cut down the legitimate expenditures of the Conference. We are branching out. If the committees that have submitted reports this year had sent in the bills they were entitled to send in, we would face a deficit of a thousand dollars instead of \$500. Your officers have been most economical. Because of the condition of the exchequer, instead of using the appropriation of \$200 I have used so far exactly \$64. And I will say that \$25 a month to conduct the office of Corresponding Secretary is too small an appropriation.

Rabbi Morgenstern—This is a matter which, as most of you know, is very dear to my heart, not because of the particular charms of the situation, but because of my, alas, too great familiarity with the situation. It is a situation with which I, as former chairman of the Finance Committee, have wrestled for a long time with but

little result. It is the situation with which the present chairman of this committee has wrestled with the same result. We have a definite and a pressing problem before us: How to increase the income of our General Fund. This Conference has committed itself to a large number of undertakings from which it can not possibly retreat, and which involve the expenditure of large sums of money. I agree fully with those speakers who regret the necessity of the consideration of this last alternative, of increasing our General Fund by decreasing the Pension Fund. I feel very sympathetic with the Pension Fund, but at the same time I can not but be imbued with the same spirit as some of those members who argue so strongly for the necessity of greater economy in our expenditures. They are the very ones who, in a noble generosity founded upon sympathy with worthy undertakings, vote away our funds. I claim that there can be no greater economy in the present administration of the affairs of this Conference. You can not possibly reduce our expenditures from the General Fund. On the contrary, you must look into the future and realize that these expenditures are bound to increase year by year, and furthermore, increase very rapidly. While chairman of this committee, I made a careful and detailed study of the increase in expenditures from the General Fund for the last ten years, and I found that they increased about 20 per cent. per annum. Accordingly we must look forward to the time when these expenditures will no longer be \$2500, but between \$3000 and \$4000 if we are to accomplish the work we have undertaken. Furthermore, as the preceding speaker has stated, we have a committee whose duty it is to make an active and effective campaign to increase our funds, particularly our Relief Fund. Again, if we continue our Relief Fund as at present, the time must come when it will be inadequate to support all our superannuated rabbis. It is imperative that we increase this fund from some other source. I therefore urge a consideration of this question from a practical standpoint. Sentiment is very nice, very important, and if it were merely a matter of sentiment we would give our entire receipts to the Relief Fund, but we must face practical questions in a practical way.

The recommendation was adopted by a vote of 36 to 7.

Recommendations I-IX were adopted.

Rabbi Gries—There was one point I wanted to bring out, and that is, in reference to the surety bond. I am the treasurer at the present time, and we have a surety bond, and have had it in years past, but in reality I am inclined to believe that a surety bond as our business is now conducted, may not be necessary. It costs us \$20 a year, and our money is now so safeguarded, and comes in such form, that the Treasurer can not really handle the money at all. It would be well to refer this to the Executive Committee with power to act. Seconded and carried.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

On resolution offered by Rabbi Philipson and Rabbi Landman, a message of bon voyage was sent to Mr. Montefiore.

The discussion of the paper of Rabbi Raisin was resumed, Rabbi Schulman occupying the chair. On motion, the remarks of each speaker were limited to three minutes.

The discussion was participated in by Rabbis Deutsch, Newfield, Philipson, Frisch, Max. Raisin, Kohler, Heller, Foster, Goldenson, and Schulman. Rabbi J. Raisin had the concluding argument.

Rabbi Henry Berkowitz's paper on "Religion and the Social Evil" (see Appendix G), was then read by Rabbi Foster, and the suggestions contained within the paper were referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi A. Simon, chairman, presented the Report of the Committee on the Instruction of the Blind, Deaf Mutes, etc."

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE INSTRUCTION OF THE BLIND, DEAF MUTE, ETC.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on the Instruction of the Blind, Deaf Mute, etc., begs leave to present the following brief report. It has very little to add to the more comprehensive report presented to the Conference last November in New York.

No new development or experience concerning the instruction of dependents or defectives has been brought to its attention. Their numbers outside of New York, Philadelphia and Chicago present no serious prob-

lem. The dependents in our Jewish institutions receive a very satisfactory religious training. The deaf mute congregations in New York and Philadelphia continue their fine work, while individual rabbis and rabbinical chaplains pay regular and helpful visits to our brethren in their respective communities.

But the question of delinquency can not be so easily disposed of, and the necessary training to remedy this deplorable condition is not so readily devised and obtainable. The problem of juvenile delinquency is not confined to the East. The Central and West Central States are now called upon to meet it. Rev. Simon Peiser is at present gathering accurate statistics, and endeavoring to secure helpful information concerning the religious methods in vogue in Eastern protectorates.

Your attention is directed to a practical illustration of this committee's appeal in its last report. Due to the earnest efforts of one of its members, Rabbi Kornfeld, District Grand Lodge No. 2, I. O. B. B., appointed the following gentlemen as official visitors to the penal and correctional institutions of the following States: Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger, for Indiana; Rabbi David L. Likhaitz, for Kansas; Rabbi Joseph S. Kornfeld, for Ohio, and Mr. Norton L. Goldsmith, for Kentucky. This is work which a fraternity ought to inspire a Conference of Rabbis to encourage. These visitors have not the warrant of chaplains, yet this Conference is in a position to dignify this appointment. Most of these appointees are Rabbis—is not our duty clear?

We must all be stirred to a personal and active interest in this work. Salvation has not ceased being a Jewish duty. Every single delinquent presents a specific danger. Every legitimate avenue of helpfulness in the line of Mission Sabbath-Schools, gymnasiums, settlements, circles, play-grounds and libraries should be utilized before the child or adult comes for the first time before the court as a breaker of the law. Rabbis must urgently impress upon their congregations their religious, moral and financial responsibility towards individuals and organizations which are endeavoring, however modestly, to burn out this shame in their midst.

Your committee recommends:

- (1) That this committee shall be called "The Committee on Dependents, Defectives and Delinquents."
- (2) That the work of this committee shall be confined strictly to the religious needs of these three classes only.
- (3) That the Executive Committee request the other district grand lodges of the Order to emulate the splendid example of District Grand Lodge No. 2 in this activity, and to appoint official visitors throughout all their American districts.
- (4) We suggest, in the meanwhile, that Rabbis in their respective communities, co-operate with existing Jewish chaplains. In the absence

of such chaplains we urge that the Rabbis take upon themselves in a spirit of love, sympathy and self-sacrifice, the task of visiting and aiding our Jewish unfortunates in State and municipal institutions.

(5) That while such official visitors may perform their labor of love in a satisfactory manner, we submit that the need of regularly appointed and salaried chaplains is the most urgent social and religious insistence of your committee. Some way must be found for at least one dozen more salaried chaplains.

(6) That the co-operation and active assistance of the various Associated Jewish Charities be invited so that the discharged offender may be enabled to regain his self-respect and support himself.

Respectfully submitted,
JOSEPH S. KORNFELD,
DAVID BLAUSTEIN,
SIMON PEISER,
SOL. LOWENSTEIN,
ABRAM SIMON.

The report was received and the recommendations taken up seriatim.

Recommendations I, II, III, and IV were adopted.

Recommendations V and VI were referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Stolz—I move that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the executive officers of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, requesting that they bring it before their convention. Seconded and carried.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON.

Rabbi Philipson—The Committee on Certificate of Conversion, to whom was added Dr. Harris, submit the following certificate:

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

CERTIFICATE OF CONVERSION.

וַאֲתֵם הַרְבֵּקִים בִּיהוּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם חַיִּים בְּלִבָּם הַיּוֹם :

To All Whom These Presents May Concern, GREETING:

.....of.....
having come before me,.....,

a Rabbi in Israel, on this.....day of.....
 19...., corresponding with the Hebrew date,, 56...., with
 the expressed desire of joining the Jewish religion, and having declared
acceptance of the principles, doctrines and institutes of Juda-
 ism, a satisfactory knowledge of which I have found.....to possess,
 I,, with the sanction of
 the two associates whose names are appended hereto, have formally re-
 ceived the said.....into the Jewish faith.
 Said.....on.....part solemnly
 declares.....full belief in the tenets of Judaism, and promises faith-
 fully to remain true to its principles and to live and die in its faith.

.....
 Rabbi Congregation.....

.....
 (Associates)

.....
 (Convert)

Moved and seconded that the report be adopted.

(Vice-President Schulman in the Chair.)

President Heller—At the time when the certificate was first presented you were informed that I had requested the committee to leave out the words “the two.” I was aware that the traditional mode of procedure is that there shall be two associates, not necessarily ordained rabbis. It seems to me that there are times when practical considerations may override custom. The omission of the words “the two” does not prevent any one from having only two associates. On the other hand a person who, like myself, feels that the conversion will be more impressive if performed in the presence of the entire congregational board is privileged to do so. You ought not to compel me, as you will if you adopt this certificate, each time to strike out the words “the two,” and substitute the word “ten.” I do not want to compel you to have more than two associates, but I do not think you ought to compel me to have only two. I want to add also that I have numerous conversions, having had as many as four in the last eight months, and I am therefore particularly interested in having this certificate so framed that I shall not have to change it each time.

Rabbi Kohler—The point of view of Rabbi Heller differs from

that of the committee. It is not the traditional view. The members of the congregation are not the associates of the rabbi. According to tradition, three men, versed in Jewish law, should decide the matter. But inasmuch as two other rabbis may not be easily found in some communities, your committee has found it wiser to accept the word "associate," meaning thereby some one who is above the average in his knowledge of Jewish law. Therefore, the committee has based itself upon tradition in having two associates besides the rabbi. Rabbi Heller's view is not founded on tradition.

Rabbi Gries—I would prefer that the phrase "with the sanction of two associates," be stricken from the body of the certificate, and that at the end we have the heading "associates," so that those who have two may sign two, and those who have ten may sign ten. I offer this as an amendment. Seconded.

Rabbi Philipson—I, also, believe in continuing tradition if possible, but would break with tradition if there is no longer any harmony with the spirit and needs of our time. I think we can continue this tradition, and there can be no possible objection to Rabbi Heller's continuing as he has done and still accept this certificate. It does say in the presence of two associates, or with the sanction of two associates. Now you can receive your convert in the presence of a hundred if you want to, but only two need sign. You marry a couple in the presence of a hundred people but they do not all sign the marriage certificate.

Rabbi Heller—I would like to make a suggestion which might reconcile the two views. Of course I understand that some of us may prize very highly the original custom and may not wish to obliterate it. Now if "the two" be stricken out, and if there are two lines for associates printed, why then it would signify that the custom would be to have two associates, and instead of saying "two" in the body of the document, you simply have two lines ready there to be filled with the names of the associates. Then I can very well add another line without altering the body of the certificate.

Rabbi Schulman—I feel that the original wording should be retained, because this would indicate that it is the sense of the

Conference that a rabbi should not convert without two associates. That is really important. As has already been explained by Rabbi Kohler, wide latitude is given to the interpretation of associates. But it is in my opinion essential to the ceremony of conversion, stripped as it is of much of symbolism and dignity, that it have two associates. Otherwise it would seem to give any rabbi the right to convert alone.

The amendment was lost.

The original motion prevailed.

The report as a whole was adopted.

Rabbi Morgenstern—As the matter stands we have adopted the conversion certificate but have not provided for its printing. I therefore move that this matter be referred to the Executive Committee with instructions to devise the manner in which the certificate shall be printed and also to deal with the question whether there should be a separate part of the certificate to be preserved as a record in the archives.

Seconded and carried.

Rabbi Wm. S. Friedman then presented the report of his committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Church and State begs leave to report as follows:

In view of the attitude of the Conference in referring to the Committee on Church and State matters that bear on prejudice against the Jew,—such as the caricature of the Jew on the stage and improper and misleading newspaper reports of our sacred days,—the committee has been led to believe that the scope of its work has been widely enlarged and includes efforts to thwart attempts at belittling the standing of the Jew as well as to protect him against any infringement upon his constitutional rights. Therefore, your committee, realizing that individual endeavor to prevent the caricature of the Jew on the stage has proven futile, has entered into correspondence with the New York Managers' Association, and has been assured that said organization has no sympathy with the lampooning of the Jew on the stage, and will exert its influence towards discouraging said caricatures.

I. We recommend that members of the Conference report to your

committee objectionable impersonations of the Jew that come to their notice.

II. We further recommend that whenever the word "Jew" is applied in the local press to malefactors, members of the Conference protest against this manifest injustice.

III. It needs no argument to convince us that fitting and dignified accounts of our holy days will do much towards impressing the public with correct ideas concerning our faith and its symbols. We therefore recommend that the committee be at once empowered to publish accounts of our sacred days, and so to distribute them to members of the Conference, that with data of local interest inserted by the rabbis, they may be given to the daily press.

In reviewing the court decisions of several states on the question of the Bible in the Public Schools, your committee has observed that the term "sectarian" has been variously interpreted. Courts whose decision was adverse to the retention of the Bible in the Public Schools, defined "sectarian" as synonymous with credal distinctions; those favoring the use of the Bible in the Public Schools interpreted "sectarian" as connoting Christian denominational divisions. The ground on which the latter decision and definition of "sectarian" was based, was that this was a Christian country. Our view without equivocation is that the word "sectarian" implies whatever differentiates and discriminates between one religion and another. Your committee feels that it is the duty of the Conference to present to the public cogent and impressive reasons for this view.

IV. We therefore recommend that a tract be published setting forth the thesis that from a constitutional standpoint "this is not a Christian country," and warning against the menace of sectarianism to our republican form of government.

V. We recommend further that the purpose of informing the public, so far as is within our power, of the dangers of sectarianism, members of the Conference avail themselves and court the opportunity of making propaganda along these lines.

VI. In this connection, we would note that, notwithstanding the insistent demand for religious instruction in the public schools, the Conference tract "The Bible in the Public Schools," which, whenever utilized, has proven highly effective, has been sparingly called for. A large number of copies lie undistributed in the lumber room of our agent. We recommend that they be circulated wherever the subject is in controversy.

The Conference should certainly be informed every year of the status of sectarianism throughout the country. It is, therefore, essential that your committee be supplied with all possible material on this subject, whether coming from legislatures, courts or school boards.

VII. We, therefore, recommend that an appropriation be allowed your

committee enabling it to subscribe to press clipping bureaus which will gather the information sought.

We would call the attention of the Conference to the clear-cut decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois handed down June 29, 1910, affirming the principle that religion should not be taught in the public schools.

It is in place that the Conference be made aware of other work your committee has in hand. It is attempting to nullify the requirement in many High Schools of the reading of *The Merchant of Venice* as preparatory to College admission; it is collecting data of sectarian influence contained in text books used in the public schools with the object of proceeding towards its elimination.

In all of which the co-operation of the Conference is imperative.

Respectfully submitted,

WM. S. FRIEDMAN, *Chairman.*

DAVID LEFKOWITZ.

ABRAM SIMON.

The report was received and taken up seriatim.

Recommendations I, II, and III were adopted.

Recommendation IV was referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendations V was lost, and VI was adopted.

Recommendation VII was referred to the Executive Committee with favor.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

The amendment to the constitution presented at the New York Conference and printed in *Year Book*, Vol. XIX, page 45, was, on motion, referred to the Committee on Resolutions for re-wording.

The Report of the Committee on Systematic Theology was presented by its chairman, Rabbi Schulman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: I can only report progress; I have no formal report to make. I do not wish to give you the impression that your chairman has neglected the work, not at all. He has been in correspondence in reference to this matter with all the members of the committee scattered all over the country; but again, this committee, as in the case of the Geiger Centenary Committee, owing to some resignations from the Conference,

and consequently from the committee, has been hampered in its work in reference to the subject matter decided on by the Conference some two years ago, and nothing definite could be done. It was my hope to meet a sufficient number of the members of the committee here in the Conference so as to present a definite report. As there are two members of this committee here besides myself, and the committee is a large one, I could not make any such report. The only report I can make with respect to the matter which may require the work of a number of years, is progress.

S. SCHULMAN, *Chairman.*

The report was received.

The Report of the Committee on Minister's Hand Book was presented by its chairman, Rabbi M. Harris.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE MINISTER'S HAND BOOK.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The printed manuscript of a Minister's Hand Book, the painstaking product of the last Conference, has been handed to us to be used as a basis for completed work. It contains in all fifteen services, as follows: Marriage Ceremony, Silver and Golden Marriage Service, the Rite of Initiation, Prayer for Naming of the Child in the Synagogue, Service for Confirmation, Prayer for the Sick-room, Prayer at the Death-bed, Funeral Service at the House of Mourning, Burial Service at the Cemetery, Service for the Setting of Tomb-stones, Ritual for the Reception of Proselytes, Service for Corner-stone laying, Service for Temple Dedication, Service for the Dedication of a Home, Service for Consecration at the Cemetery.

Owing to the brevity of time between 1909 and 1910 Conferences, it has been recommended to your committee that they present to you a plan of revision and amplification of the present manuscript rather than a completed work. This will have the further advantage of enabling your committee to learn the exact wishes of the Conference, so that it need not give its time to fruitless labor. Replies to a circular letter issued by the chairman of the committee have aided in formulating the following suggestions:

First—*Marriage Service* (See Year Book, Vol. I). Apart from some changes in the diction, the words of consent and promise of fidelity should be voiced by the contracting parties, and their avowal not limited to a bare affirmative.

Second—*Silver and Golden Wedding Service*. Is it the desire of the Conference to incorporate such service in the Hand Book?

Third—*Initiation into the Abrahamic Covenant*. In place of the words assigned to the father of the child "The Lord has made the Covenant

.....our forefathers," the following sentence be utilized from the additional circumcision service and its Grace after Meals,—"Even as this child..... has now entered this covenant, so may he be initiated into the Covenant of the Law of marriage and good works." "May the Most Merciful bless the father and mother of this child and give them the merit of rearing and training him and of teaching him wisdom from this eighth day forward. May the Eternal, his God, always be with him.

"May the Most Merciful bless the parent who has here observed the Covenant of the Circumcision, rejoicing to execute the righteous comment with pious gladness. May his good work be recompensed, may the Lord set him exceedingly high.

"May the Most Merciful bless the tender infant circumcised on this the eighth day. May his hands and heart be always directed to the God of faithfulness, so that he be worthy to appear before the Eternal." That the benediction of the Mohel be omitted.

The custom should be inaugurated of the rabbi conducting the religious part of the service.

Third—*Prayer at the Naming of the Child in the Synagogue.* In place of the present, the committee submits this briefer form:

Almighty Father, with grateful gladness, the mother..... appears in Thy Sanctuary this day, to ask Thy blessing on the..... Thou hast graciously bestowed. May the name..... now given..... be ever one of honor. O grant that the child may be spared to the home its advent has brightened and reared in the obligations of the Jewish faith. May its future be such as to bring joy to its parents and blessing to man. Amen.

Fourth—*Confirmation Service.* Your committee recommends that nothing be given here in extenso, except the Declaration of the Jewish faith, for which it has drawn up a form. Many Rabbis prefer that their confirmants prepare their own themes, subject to later editorial revision. The outline, however, in the Hand Book, should contain as complete a list of themes as possible, which may be utilized by the Rabbi to the extent of the number of confirmants in each case. Following are the recommended themes:

(a) Under the heading God, various aspects of Divinity, His Omnipresence, Omnipotence, Providence, Creator, Father, Worship, Faith.

(b) Man. The soul, freedom of will, human accountability, conscience, idealism, immortality.

(c) Ethics. Particularly, such as have received special emphasis in Judaism, such as holiness, peace, hospitality, charity, obedience, patience. Under this heading should come the duties of all social groups; parents, teachers, elders, neighbors, strangers, those of other religions. It should also include patriotism and also duty to dumb creatures.

(d) Institutes in Judaism. The Sabbath, the three Festivals, the two Holy Days, the two minor feasts, the Omer, religious ceremonial, the Hebrew tongue.

(e) Israel. The Bible, the Prophets, the Law, the Rabbis, the Martyrs. Israel the servant, the Jewish woman Ruth, the Messianic time, the Mission of Israel.

The service should include the outline of the Floral Offering, the symbolic association of the Harvest Festival and the decoration of the synagogue with flowers, with the consecration of youth to the Law of Israel.

It should next contain a recommendation that the service of the day be conducted, as far as possible, by the confirmants, and that certainly one of them read the Law from the Scroll.

The confirmation should be incorporated in the service, not introduced at its close.

DECLARATION OF THE JEWISH FAITH.

God is one, perfect, spiritual, eternal; the omnipresent Creator of all that is; the omniscient Ruler of the Universe: the wise and loving Father of mankind.—The Sh'ma.

Man is endowed with Reason, through which he acquires a knowledge of the world and its laws. He is endowed with Conscience, whereby he learns to distinguish between right and wrong; and with Freewill to choose the good and reject the evil.

Man is of dual nature—body and soul. The body is material and is but the medium through which earthly life manifests itself; it is evanescent and decays at death. The soul is spiritual, stamped with the divine image; it is the essence of man's being and is immortal.

Man is accountable to God for all his actions. He should make divine perfection his ideal standard of conduct and be holy because God is holy.

God chastens His children as a wise father the child he loves. Pain, struggle, and sorrow are divine educators, developing the noblest capacities of the soul.

Israel, gifted with the genius for religion, were the first to recognize the sole God and His law of righteousness. The revelation of the divine Father, which they were best fitted to receive, singled them out as God's witnesses. Hence they became a kingdom of priests, whose mission was to bring a knowledge of the Eternal and His law to mankind. They were called God's chosen servants, who must be ready, if needs be, to suffer contumely and martyrdom in bringing light to the Gentiles.

The discipline of man in the school of life, the fuller truth gradually revealed to him in generations of experience is steadily making clearer to his mind and heart the final purpose of providence and humanity's destiny.

Thus in the latter days, the Messianic Time, all mankind will at last be united as one loving family in unity and peace, learning war no more.

Then will the earth be filled with the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea.

This declaration should be followed by three questions and replies as to the confirmant's promise to be loyal to Judaism. But this response should be carefully worded to avoid the form of a vow. Let me recommend the following questions and replies:

Question I—You stand here now in the presence of the Almighty, and this sanctuary is as Mt. Sinai. Are you prepared to cling to the living God?

Answer—May our faith in God and His goodness never waver, but may it grow with our growth and strengthen with our strength. (Hebrew.)

Question II—You know the difference between right and wrong. See now before you, life and good, death and evil, will you choose the good?

Answer—We promise to be faithful to all the duties that life may bring and ever to listen to the still small voice of conscience—the voice of God within us. (Hebrew.)

Question III—You are aware of the responsibilities of your great religion—the mother of many religions; are you willing to suffer that its cause may prevail and to give yourselves for the spread of its truth?

Answer—We will strive to be loyal to all the obligations devolving upon us as Israelites, to carry God's message of righteousness far and wide—to live by the light of God's Law, and to hasten by our own conduct the reign of peace and good will among all the families of the earth. And all proclaim (Hebrew).

שמע	Hebrew and English.
ברוך שם	Hebrew and English.
יי הוא	Hebrew and English.

Fifth—*Prayer for the Sick-Room.* The committee here formulated this general proposition. It is unnecessary to fill the Hand Book with prayers for the minister written in extenso, except such as are to be incorporated in the public ritual. The presumption should be that if the Rabbi is at all fit for his office, he should be able to prepare for himself appropriate prayers for all occasions.

Sixth—*Funeral Services at House and at Cemetery and Service for Tomb-stone Setting.* On the general principle that the Conference should not needlessly duplicate work, we recommend under this general heading, the following booklets: For Funeral Service at Home and Cemetery, the book known as "The Burial of the Dead," prepared by the Conference of Eastern Rabbis, or if no longer in print, that it be reproduced here. For service at tomb-stone setting, or on visiting the cemetery, the committee recommends the book called "The Door of Hope," prepared by the New York Board of Jewish Ministers, 1898, accessible to all Rabbis.

Seventh—*Reception of Proselytes.* The committee recommends here only

changes in diction and abbreviation generally. The questions should be fewer and more comprehensive. In the Declaration of the Jewish faith, in place of number 4, a paragraph on the mission of Israel, or the form as found in Confirmation Service. In place of the rather long certificate of conversion the committee recommends the following shorter form:

This is to Certify

that

.....
 having carefully studied the principles, doctrines and institutions of the Jewish Religion, was received into the fold of Israel at.....own express wish and desire: after renouncing the religion in which..... had been reared, after solemnly declaring.....full belief in the tenets of Judaism, and after faithfully promising to remain true to its principles and to live and die in its faith.

Signature of Officiating Rabbi.

.....
 Signature of Witnesses.

Signature of Proselyte.

Eighth—*The Corner-stone Laying* in the present manuscript is a good example of just what most services of the Hand Book should be, i. e., a program of service, with full Biblical reference, rather than an elaborate amplification of prayers. So, for example, the prayer at the dedication, in the service following, is entirely unnecessary and should be indicated only. Also the prayer at the dedication of a new home.

In addition to services already given, the committee recommends a prayer to be recited on the occasion of a Bar Mitzvah in such congregations as still maintain the rite, and a prayer on the occasion of a Jahrzeit. As these would be read during divine service, they partake of the nature of ritual and therefore should be given in the manual in extenso. Your committee recommends the following:

FOR A BAR MITZVAH.

Almighty Father, may Thy blessing rest upon.....
 called to the Law this Sabbath Day. May he realize the privilege of his religious birthright, be ever ready to accept its responsibilities and to carry the message of the Law afar. Grant that his career be such as to shed lustre on Israel and he be of service to the world. Amen.

FOR A YAHRZEIT.

Almighty Father, we recall with loving remembrance, our (brother)in this anniversary week of (his) death. May.....nearest and dearest cherish.....memory as long as life lasts. May the thought of.....and the thought of that which was best in.....move us all to general deeds, thus making.....memory a continued influence for good. O teach us all to trust Thee in death as in life. Amen.

Your committee also recommends that the Hand Book contain a list of Laws (Dinim) for practical use by the Rabbi, that he may utilize as Responsa for various congregational needs.

MAURICE H. HARRIS, *Chairman*,
NATHAN STERN,
H. G. ENELOW.

On motion, the report was received and made the first order of business for the next morning.

The Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions was read by its chairman, Rabbi I. Aaron.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your Committee on Memorial Resolutions begs leave to present the following report.

It is in consonance with a particularly powerful and beautiful Jewish sentiment, and a striking emphasis of our deep sense of fraternity, that we pause in our annual meetings to recall with loving thought and prayerful utterance, the members of the Conference who have passed away during the year. So let there be upon our lips and in our hearts, at this time, the names of Sigmund Mannheimer and Benjamin Bonnheim.

In the death of Sigmund Mannheimer, for more than twenty-five years professor at the Hebrew Union College, the Conference has lost one of its oldest and most devoted members.

We most sincerely deplore the removal from our midst of a man whose solid learning commanded our respect, who in the performance of duty was an exemplar of industry, as well as of faithfulness in the service of God and his Word and the sincerity of whose character made him generally beloved.

Rabbi Benjamin N. Bonnheim, late of Cincinnati, Ohio, was a member of our Conference for many years. In his demise, we deplore the passing of

a most faithful leader and teacher, who devoted his life to expounding and spreading the truths of Judaism.

Be it Resolved, Therefore, That we remember with sorrow the departure of these brethren from our midst, and that we feel grateful for the work they accomplished in life.

Be it also Resolved, That this testimony of our sorrow and esteem be embodied in the minutes of the Conference, and that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the families of the deceased.

J. A. AARON, *Chairman*,
LEON VOLMER,
JACOB MIELZINER,
DAVID ALEXANDER,
HORACE WOLF,
LOUIS D. GROSS.

The report was adopted by a rising vote.

The Committee on Tracts, presented its report through its chairman, Rabbi Max. Heller.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRACTS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Largely owing to the brevity of the time, your Committee on Tracts has published no tract since our last Convention, though it has a tract under way. It is to be hoped that in time we may have the facilities and the means for publishing tracts in more rapid succession and in larger numbers. A tract campaign calls for large financial resources, and for aggressive methods. Your committee would recommend that our members place, both before their congregation and before people of generous disposition, the claims to support of our tract enterprise; it is to be hoped that in time congregations will set aside regular annual contributions for this purpose, and that the cause will be remembered in the wills of discriminating testators. We have the promise from one of our most important Yiddish papers that Tract No. 2 is to be published serially in its columns. We request that the past year's appropriation from committee be carried over to the next year.

MAX. HELLER, *Chairman*,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
JOSEPH STOLZ.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I move that the report be received, and that those portions which overlap the work of other committees be referred to the proper committees. Seconded and carried.

The following amendment to the constitution was offered by Rabbi Leo M. Franklin, and seconded.

Resolved, That Article VI, Section III, of the Constitution, be amended so as to read:

"No member of the Conference shall be elected as an executive member of the Board for more than three terms successively. This shall not be construed to apply to membership on the Board in virtue of service as President, Vice-President, Secretary, or Treasurer of the Conference."

The Conference adjourned.

MONDAY MORNING, JULY 4, 1910.

The Convention was opened with prayer by Rabbi Sigmund Hecht.

President Heller—In honor of this day let us join in singing our national anthem.

(The Convention rose and sang "America.")

The minutes of the previous meeting were read.

President Heller—We shall now proceed with the discussion of the report of the Committee on Minister's Hand Book.

Rabbi Guttmacher—I desire to ask the chairman what the object of the reading of his report now is, and what he intends to accomplish thereby. I acknowledge that the report of the Committee on Minister's Hand Book is in better shape this year than ever before, but I feel we are not ready to vote upon it, not having printed copies before us. After all, it is only in tentative form, and I think it would be better for the committee to have the report printed and sent to the members, and then vote on it at our next session.

Rabbi Harris—Just to avoid fruitless labor, the report is prepared in the form in which it is. There are some things you can not intelligently vote upon, and there are other things upon which you can. I will simply read the recommendations. First, the book contains the Marriage Service printed in the former Year Book. The committee does not wish to alter it except to improve its diction. The word "consent," and the promise of fidelity are matters

upon which the Conference can vote. It is a question of the advisability of the form of a marriage service.

Rabbi Kohler—The chairman has said he would accept the old formula with merely a change of diction. While I have already stated my principle of loyalty to tradition, as far as possible, I wish to express here very emphatically my dissent from the old custom still accepted or adhered to in this old formula. We do not want a benediction that defies translation. A benediction which goes back to the time when the bridal couple was in the Chuppa, and the Chuppa meant the bridal chamber, has absolutely no significance to us, and is jarring on our sense of propriety.

Rabbi Harris—I have always felt that this formula is not satisfactory, because strictly speaking, it gives no Jewish coloring to the marriage ceremony. The principle is general that all human beings are supposed to obey the law of God. There is nothing concrete about the formula. It is inadequate. May I be permitted to suggest a formula I have used for the last fifteen years: "With this ring I wed thee to be consecrated unto me according to the faith of Israel and the law of God." We have always insisted upon the expression of "the faith of Israel." If a man or woman comes to us to be married they want a Jewish marriage. Otherwise, they would go to the magistrate.

No action was taken on this part of the report.

The second suggestion regarding silver and golden wedding services was approved.

Chairman Harris then read the third recommendation.

Rabbi Harris—I am giving the translation in one of the old prayer books. I left out the words "eighth day." Do you want that in or left out?

Rabbi Hecht—I would like to know why the eighth day should be obligatory. I know, and many of you know that often these ceremonies are held on some day other than the eighth day.

Rabbi Schulman—It is well known, according to Jewish tradition, if the child is too weak on the eighth day, or if there are any valid causes for postponement, the Jewish law has always

allowed such. I think, however, we should keep the classical formula.

Rabbi Landman—May I ask why the chairman retains the singular "May God bless this parent, etc."

Rabbi Harris—We have not touched the traditional word.

Rabbi Philipson—It seems to me we ought not to pass over Rabbi Landman's suggestion. After all, if we are going to change the traditional reading, it may be well to consider whether we had not better insert the words "these parents" instead of this parent.

The next recommendation, referring to the confirmation service, was read.

Rabbi Philipson—It seems to me that we have now come to the place where we ought to express ourselves in regard to the character of the confirmation service. The reading of individual essays by the confirmants and the like, lends to our confirmation the appearance of closing exercises at school. I submit whether it would not be better to draw up a confirmation service that shall be essentially a religious exercise and not an exhibition. Every man who has had experience with the confirmation service has found that the more he eliminates this exhibition feature the more impressive the service becomes. If our committee could draw up a program of confirmation, namely, what it shall consist of, an opening prayer, a declaration of principles, reading from the Torah, etc., that would be sufficient. We ought to declare ourselves here in some way upon this matter of essays.

Rabbi Heller—This is a point of great importance. We should avoid approving or disapproving of the essay policy. We are not called upon to adopt the resolution condemning those who have employed it, but we ought to avoid in our Ministers' Hand Book endorsing it. Perhaps we might agree on that without further debate. Is it so agreed?

Agreed.

Rabbi Kohler—The declaration of faith, and in general the confirmation of the children ought to be a thing in which the congregation should take an active part. It is a mistake to allow the children to do everything with the congregation simply looking on.

When the declaration of faith is made by the children, the whole congregation should join in.

Rabbi Harris—The committee felt that what is needed is a certain uniformity in the service, the amplification of the prayer should be left to the individual.

Rabbi Schulman—On this question of principle, I fully agree with Dr. Harris. Disabuse your mind of prejudice against the essay feature. Don't call it essay and the thing will have immediately a different appearance. In Temple Beth-El the practice has been for many years to give these things up to the children wholly. I write them for the children; this is understood by the children and the congregation, because it is known the child could not possibly write anything worth listening to. The idea is that the children reproduce in the form of themes, the whole subject matter taught during the confirmation year. By the time the program is completed the congregation has had its memory refreshed as to all the principal features of the Jewish religion.

Moved and seconded that a list of themes be printed in the Hand Book.

Rabbi Stolz—I rise to a point of order. This motion simply means that in the manuscript which this committee will send out there will be a list of themes. This does not commit us to anything.

Rabbi Philipson—Then I would request that it is recorded that this action does not commit the Conference to the theme-policy for the confirmation.

Carried.

Rabbi Stolz—I move that it be the sense of this Conference that the prayers shall be printed in full.

Seconded and carried.

The next recommendation was adopted without debate.

The next recommendation, relating to the conduct of the holiday services by the children, was read.

Rabbi Schulman—I move that the Conference instruct the committee that we do not favor the recommendation. Seconded.

Rabbi Klein—It seems to me that we are not unanimous in trying to have the services conducted by the children. Many of us

have been in the habit of making the confirmation quite elaborate; but if you want to have a simple service in which the children participate, give them the services to perform so that it will insure their presence, and make it practically a religious service, and accustom the children to it. In what better way can you give expression of your desire to make those children members of the congregation?

Rabbi Gries—Rabbi Schulman and those who agree with him may be very strong in their conviction as to the result of their own experiences. My experience, where the children were kept out of the Temple until the close of the service, is quite the opposite. A principle is involved here. The protest is made, and with justice, against the essay and theme idea. I did not participate in that discussion, but I think the chairman of the committee would have avoided the difficulty if he had not used the word essay or theme, and had simply said "portion." Now it is traditional that the weekly portion of the Torah be read by seven men. Why shouldn't we call up every child for a portion of the service? Do not protest against it, and say the minister is the only one that can read the service. That is not Jewish. For myself I am opposed, just as the others are, to the essay idea and the theme idea, but I do believe in the children conducting the services.

Rabbi Schulman—I am delighted for once to have Brother Gries stand up for tradition. But he misunderstands me. Of course, I want the children to participate as individuals as much as possible in the confirmation. That is why I believe in giving each one a part; that is why I believe in the theme. In respect to conducting the service as such, if I understood the chairman of the committee rightly, what he intends to do with the whole Shabouth service by the phrase "as far as possible" is to leave it to the individual. It means that the children shall take part in the service as far as possible. To that I am opposed. The children might come into the Temple so that they can take part in the service by their presence.

Rabbi Philipson—The children are not yet confirmed, and therefore, even according to Jewish tradition they are not eligible to

take part in the service. I am opposed to this wide-spread idea of having the children's service in the synagogue. It is all right in the school. I am opposed altogether to this suggestion of the committee that the children to be confirmed shall conduct the Shabuoth service.

Rabbi Frisch—I offer this amendment that until we have clarified matters, this clause of the committee's report, which refers to this subject, be stricken from the report, leaving all members of the Conference to act as they desire. Seconded.

Rabbi Heller—There is no necessity for this Convention to put itself on record as to whether the children shall take part in the service or not, or whether the children shall write themes or not. I am opposed to themes, but I do not propose to crowd my opinion down other people's throats. I regret that the committee should have come before us in order to commit us in favor of the children's participating in the service, although I am in favor of it myself. I hope the substitute offered by Rabbi Frisch will be carried, because it will leave the matter as it has been before.

Rabbi Morgenstern—There is one important consideration we are losing sight of: This Minister's Hand Book must serve a double purpose. On the one hand, certain prayers and ceremonies will form a Minister's Ritual which the Rabbi should follow; on the other hand, there are certain ceremonies that can serve only as suggestions that the minister may or may not follow. The matter of confirmation services is largely individualistic, and will vary from year to year. I therefore believe that the most practical way of dealing with this question would be to refer this whole matter of confirmation back to the committee with this instruction, that they present in large type, in the manuscript, those prayers and ceremonies that have become traditional in Reform congregations, such as the opening prayer, the closing prayer, the floral prayer, etc.; and that in fine print they embody statements containing suggestions based upon the experience of various committees. Then in these suggestions they could state that some congregations have themes and essays, some have children participate in the

services, and so forth. That would allow the individual rabbi to act as he chooses. I offer this as a substitute.

Seconded and carried.

The next recommendation was read and approved.

The summary of the Jewish Faith was next read.

Rabbi Philipson—As I understand, the chairman of the committee proposed to have the children vow or swear to something. Does this declaration require them to accept some principle? If so, they then promise something, namely, to accept these principles. How can such a declaration of principles be made without some such introduction?

Rabbi Harris—On the matter of intellectual belief, we have no right to make a child say "I will;" we do not know what intellectual change may enter in that child's mind. On the other hand, on the matter of right and wrong, we have that right.

Rabbi Schulman—The children should make a direct, positive statement, "I believe and I accept for myself the religion of the fathers." The intellectual belief of the child may change. But we shall try to lay the foundation deep, so that the storms shall not touch them, and when they stand before us we want them to say without equivocation, "We accept the religion of our fathers."

The suggestion was approved of.

The recommendation relating to services for the sick was read.

Rabbi Stolz—I object to this for several reasons. The very object of the hand book is to provide some formula. It is very embarrassing on the part of a friend when he stands beside the sick bed of another friend to extemporize a prayer which shall be a fitting expression. It is a comfort many times to a man to know a prayer is stated, and is read at all times, and there is a psychological influence, the value of which can not be over-estimated, therefore, I move that this prayer and all other prayers be written out.

Seconded and carried.

The outline of the funeral service was read.

Rabbi Kohler—Three or four years ago, I moved that we have special rules concerning the recital of Kaddish. Every rabbi is

asked how long the Kaddish should be recited. A great many questions come to people, and the minister is not always ready to look up the Shulchan Aruch and decide accordingly. Therefore, such a rule or formula or set of rules should be given.

Rabbi Gries—Let a proper committee be appointed to formulate certain rules stating the practice of to-day, and the law and the established custom. Let us know what the custom was. Let us know upon what basis that custom and that law rested. This work can be done by the Committee on Responsa. I offer this as a motion.

Seconded and carried.

The Report of the Committee on Minister's Hand Book was then adopted as amended, with instructions to print and distribute manuscript subject to the Executive Committee.

The following Report of the Committee on Civil and Religious Marriage Laws was next presented by Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, chairman, and on motion referred to the Executive Committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS MARRIAGE LAWS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN—Your Committee on Civil and Religious Marriage Laws begs leave to report that it has commenced to work on the subject assigned to it, but has found the task such a tremendous one, involving as it does a thorough investigation of Jewish marriage regulations from Biblical times down to our own days, and of the civil laws on marriage in all the States of the Union, that it is as yet unprepared to present a final report. The committee has, however, evolved a tentative working plan, together with several recommendations, which it submits for your approval. All the members of the committee are to study the entire subject of marriage laws in Jewish religious authorities and in the civil statutes of the various States of the Union, and possibly also of England and other foreign countries, noting conflicts and agreements between the religious and civil legislation, selecting the superior regulations of each wherever they differ, and formulating a composite system which, while in harmony with the laws of the land, will contain additional ethical restraints that may be used by the rabbi, through the exercise of his privilege to refuse to officiate in the mar-

riage function, to safeguard the welfare of the parties entering the matrimonial bonds and of society as a whole.

While all the members of the committee are to investigate the entire field of marriage, each one will specialize on a given phase of the subject, embodying his findings in a paper on one of the following topics:

The Status of Woman, Legal and Social.

Prohibited Marriages.

Re-marriage.

It is also the intention of the committee to invite two or three Jewish lawyers, familiar with both the civil and religious laws, to contribute, without cost to the Conference, brief papers dealing with the subject from the legal standpoint, as an aid to the more ethical interests of the committee. These papers, together with those prepared by members of the committee, are to form the basis for resolutions to be presented by the committee to the Conference, which resolutions, if adopted, are to be used as guiding principles by the members of the Conference.

In line with the plan of our work laid out above, we, the committee, make the following recommendations:

1. That the name of this committee be changed from Committee on Harmonization of Mosaic and Modern Marriage Laws to "Committee on Religious and Civil Marriage Laws." We prefer to eliminate the word "Harmonization," because we understand our work seeks more than harmonization; rather revision and betterment. Again the designation "Mosaic" would limit the scope of the committee's studies to the laws of the Bible. This limitation was certainly not intended when the committee was appointed, and if intended then, is surely not desired now. The committee purposes to consider not only Biblical laws, but also laws and regulations found in Philo and Josephus, the Mishnah and Gemara, in Maimonides, Asheri and the Shulchan Aruch and principles and procedure advocated by authorities of Reform Judaism.

2. That the work of this committee shall not include the subject of intermarriage, this subject having been considered in previous conferences.

3. That the papers prepared by members of the committee and by the invited contributors be published in the Appendix of the Year Book, and so far as feasible, read before the Conference.

As a sample of the papers desired from the lawyers invited to contribute, we append an article written at the request of the committee by B. H. Hartogensis, Esq., of Baltimore, which, with the permission of the President, we promised to read before the Conference. The committee takes this opportunity of thanking Mr. Hartogensis sincerely for this helpful contribution.

Respectfully submitted,

EPHRAIM FRISCH, *Chairman*,
S. N. DEINARD,
ABRAM S. ANSPACHER,
HENRY BARNSTEIN.

JEWISH MARRIAGES AND AMERICAN LAW.

BY B. H. HARTOGENSIS, of the Baltimore Bar.

Marriages of uncles to nieces are not allowed in any of the United States with a single exception, and that made to Jews only; while first cousins may not intermarry in a number of States, yet they are usual, and rabbis, even those well informed, frequently disregard the law, probably without knowledge of the serious consequences; and the same is true of laymen Jews, of all conditions and length of residence. So I have accepted an invitation of the chairman of your Committee on the Harmonization of Jewish and American Laws to write further (Note 1) on the law of this subject and to point out some dangers of too close adherence to the rabbinical preference for such marriages of those near of kin. With such information as I shall set down, it should not be difficult to hold with the Talmudic maxim, *Dino' d' malchutho Dino*, the law of the land is paramount.

While the Talmud permitted, nay recommended, marriages between uncle and niece (Note 2), (probably because of a tender solicitude for the daughter of one's sister perhaps widowed) such a marriage is now everywhere prohibited in the United States and is frequently denounced as incestuous and void from the beginning; but such a marriage may be contracted by Jews in the State of Rhode Island. There the prohibition as to marriages corresponding to the Levitical table of degrees (Note 3) by statute running back to 1798, does not extend to or in any way affect any marriage, which shall be solemnized among the Jews within the degrees of affinity or consanguinity allowed by their religion; but the exception really inures only to the benefit of residents, for non-residents when returning to their domicile, are likely to inflict misery on themselves and innocent offspring for offending the laws of their own States.

NOTE 1—Consanguineous Marriages before Jewish and American Law, by B. H. Hartogensis, read before the American Jewish Historical Society on February 22, 1910, published in the Jewish Exponent under the title of "Marriages of Near Kin," on the 4th of March, 1910.

NOTE 2—Mielziener "Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce," page 39, citing Talm Yebamoth 62 b. Maimonides Issure Biath II 14. Eben Haezer II 6 (gloss). Mielziener adds that modern scholars have tried to explain this in different ways: "Michaelis Mos. R., section 117, asserts that Orientalists regard a niece as a more distant relation than the aunt. Ewald "Antiquities of Israel," p. 197 says "Connection between the uncle and the niece was allowed, manifestly because here the respect due to the father or mother appeared to be less infringed." Phillipson gives another reason in his Israelit Bibel (second edition I, p. 624) based on the principle, which according to his ingenious demonstration underlies the Mosaic Law on prohibited degrees. Others again hold that in prohibiting marriages of nephew and aunt the law was principally guided by the consideration of the conflict between the marital authority which a husband is said to maintain and the authority which an aunt ordinarily exercises over her nephew, while such a consideration entirely falls away in the case where an uncle marries his niece."

NOTE 3—Archbishop Parker's Table of Degrees (Leviticus 18: 12-14 and 20: 19-20) was made part of the Common Law of England by 32 Henry VIII. ch. 38, see 4 Deut. 23, 8 and 27, 20, 22, and 23.

The avuncular marriage (Note 4) has been prohibited in most States for many years, but disallowed by statute in some only during this generation (e. g., New York). This may account for a wide-spread popular belief that in some States it is still allowed. Generally relatives of half blood are on the same footing as those of the whole blood. Intermarriage of first cousins is prohibited in many States and the list is growing. The States which now forbid them are Arizona, Arkansas, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. Marriage is prohibited to those nearer than first cousins in North Carolina, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; to those nearer than second cousins in Indiana, Montana, Nevada, Ohio, and Washington (Note 5).

In some countries such marriages are void; elsewhere and generally they are merely voidable. They are either null and void from the beginning or may be annulled even when contracted outside of the State wherein the

NOTE 4—By avuncular marriage is meant intermarriage with a brother's daughter or with a sister's daughter, or with a brother's son's wife, or with a sister's son's wife, or with a wife's brother's daughter, or with a wife's sister's daughter, etc.

NOTE 5—Stimson's Digest of American Statute Laws (edition 1886), p. 666, gives the following summary of prohibited marriages:

No man and conversely no woman, *mutatis mutandis*, may marry in most states

- (1) his lineal ancestor or descendant of his brother, sister of the half or whole blood.
- (2) Nor can there be a marriage between a man and his niece or a woman and her nephew by blood and conversely.
- (3) Nor in some states (Delaware and Kentucky) can a man marry the daughter of his brother's or sister's child or a woman the son of her brother's or sister's child.
- (4) Nor in several can a man marry his first cousin by blood—New Hampshire, Ohio, Indiana, Kansas, Arkansas, Nevada, Washington, Dakota, Montana and Wyoming.
- (5) Nor in several can marriage be contracted by parties nearer of kin than first cousins computing by the rule of Civil Law—Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Carolina and Oregon.
- (6) So not by persons nearer of kin than second cousins in Ohio, Indiana, Nevada, Washington, and Montana.
- (7) So not within the Levitical degrees, see Georgia and probably Florida. These prohibited degrees of consanguinity apply whether either person or his parent be legitimate or not.

As to affinity:

- (a) A man in many states may not marry his father's widow or a woman her mother's husband, and inversely a man may not marry his wife's daughter nor a woman her husband's son.
- (b) A man may not in many states marry his grandfather's widow nor a woman her grandmother's husband, and inversely a man may not marry his wife's granddaughter, etc.
- (c) A man may not in certain states marry his son's widow nor a woman her daughter's husband nor inversely a woman her husband's father, etc.; nor a man his mother-in-law, nor his grandson's widow nor a woman her granddaughter's husband and inversely.

In Virginia and West Virginia a man may not marry his wife's step-daughter nor a woman her husband's step-son; nor a woman her niece's husband but the provision, except in West Virginia, does not extend to the case of a man marrying his nephew's widow. And in Alabama a man may not marry his uncle's widow.

In all these cases of affinity, the prohibition continues notwithstanding the dissolution by death or divorce of the marriage on which such relationship was founded, unless the marriage was originally void, this as to Massachusetts, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

contracting parties have their domicile or residence; while penalties at home await those who go out of the State or country to evade the law. Generally ministers who perform such marriages expose themselves to fines and other penalties.

As already pointed out, these marriages in many States are voidable and not absolutely void. A marriage is said to be void when it is good for no legal purpose, and its invalidity may be maintained in any proceeding in any court between any parties whether in the lifetime of or after the death of the supposed husband, whether the question arises directly or collaterally. A marriage is said to be voidable when the imperfection can be inquired into only during the lifetime of both husband and wife. Until it is set aside, it is practically valid; when set aside it is rendered void from the beginning. (Bishop "Marriage and Divorce," Vol. 1, Sec. 119.) So that the danger to marital happiness, the blight to be put on the lives of innocent offspring is so serious that these consanguineous marriages are not to be countenanced. The penalties otherwise, moreover, are fines to the parties as well as to the minister.

Nor can one escape the letter and violate the spirit of the law by proceeding to another country or State (*De Walton v. Montefiore*, 2 Ch., 481), where such marriages are legal. This is also prohibited by many statutes and regularly by the decisions. So that rabbis should not only know the marriage laws of their own states but be fully informed of those of adjoining states, refusing to perform ceremonies of strangers, until well advised of the laws of the state or country whence they come, always discouraging going to another state or country to avoid the local law (Note 6).

NOTE 6.—It may be desirable to consider briefly marriages celebrated in America according to *lex Judaica* because of some remarkable statements appearing in a careful study made by H. S. Q. Henriques in his "Jewish Marriages and the English Law (1908)." Reprinted from Vol. 20 *Jewish Quarterly Review*, p. 391.) There is a marked distinction because the civil status of the Jews of America differs from that of our British cousins; in England an act had to be passed removing doubts as to marriage of Jews celebrated before a certain period (1847) and the Marriage Act of 1836 had to be construed as affecting Jews because first of the peculiar status of Jews before the British Law and secondly and a fortiori because of the sanction of Parliament given to marriages according to Jewish forms and ceremonies. Wherefore this author says it is a question of considerable difficulty as to how far such marriages (of Jews) are valid apart from statutory sanction. Now the civil status of Jews is fixed by the Constitution of the United States; it is the same as that of all citizens. No acts have ever been required to establish or confirm marriages here, wherefore it can be said of laws as to ritually performed marriages in England, "that their proper interpretation is by no means an easy subject." Several states have statutes recognizing marriages, if solemnized according to the rites and ceremonies of Jews, probably because under the Common Law in force in most states, the mutual consent of both parties must be interchanged in the presence of a person in holy orders: some one episcopally ordained. Bishop on Marriage, Divorce and Separation, sec. 381. Again the two witnesses in a marriage *per verba de presenti* had to be competent under the Talmudic law, neither related to the parties, nor violators of the Sabbath nor other religious ordinances, England recognizing the Jewish law as effective. Bishop, sec. 897. Of course none of these applies to cases where Jews as English citizens betake themselves for marriage, not to a minister but to a registrar. The peculiar Status of Jews in England and of the legislative sanction required for their marriage has caused several other conditions among English Jews which are without parallel in America. The same writer questions the validity of certain marriages of Jews solemnized regularly by non-conformist (Reform) rabbis,

A marriage valid where celebrated will be none the less incestuous here, if within our prohibited degrees. Comity will not permit violation of our criminal laws based on morals and public policy. (*State v. Brown*, 47 Ohio St., 102-109.)

The decisions against these marriages proceed on the theory that such a marriage is against pronounced state policy. But it is not so in the same sense as miscegenous marriages are forbidden. A Federal decision (Note 7) not reversed, makes the marriage of uncle and niece legally celebrated in a foreign country illegal here, despite the comity usually existing between countries in this respect, and the relationship is held incestuous and the married couple therefore liable to be indicted, prosecuted and punished by the laws of the State. So that in this case (in re. *Rodgers*, 109 Fed., 886), deportation under our immigration law was the result. The case is interesting and instructive. The husband had left behind in Russia his legally wedded niece and several children. He came to Pennsylvania, prospered and became a naturalized citizen; by his naturalization, his wife, too, became a citizen of the United States. Yet when she and their children reached the port of Philadelphia, the fact that the parents were so near of kin was discovered, and admission was denied to the wife and children. The case went to the courts and finally the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for Pennsylvania decided that the wife and children, otherwise admissible, must be deported. The decision has been criticised by some lawyers as unsound, but by others approved, and it remains the law of the land.

Prohibited marriages of near of kin are not to be compared to such as are wrongfully or unintentionally celebrated without a license or banns or by a minister defectively ordained or without subsequent notice to the

when such marriages are prohibited by the Jewish law, which they do not recognize, e. g., a Cohen (Aaronite) to a divorcee or proselyte or of any Jew to the sister of his divorced wife during her life time or by parties otherwise incapable of intermarriage by the Jewish law. A further anomaly touches the second marriages of divorcees by rabbis. In England "there are no statutory enactments recognizing the validity of Jewish divorces (*Deut.* 24-1) as they do Jewish marriages" says our author (*Henrique's Jewish Quarterly Review*, p. 449). "Where a Jew or Jewess who had been married according to Jewish usages and divorced by a decree of the divorce court, desires to contract a second marriage in accordance with Jewish religious rites, it is essential that the original Jewish marriage should be first dissolved by a Jewish divorce, for otherwise the second marriage were invalid by Jewish law, on the ground that one of the parties to it, according to Jewish law, is incapable of contracting it." It is singular that Jews of England would tolerate such a condition that requires their sisters to betake themselves to a rabbi to obtain a *Get* from their divorced husbands, before they can take to themselves new spouses. It is certain that we have no such a state of affairs in any of the states of this country.

NOTE 7—Among the Jews in Russia, where the marriage ceremony took place, it had been satisfactorily proved that the marriage is lawful and being valid there, the general rule undoubtedly is, that such a marriage would be regarded everywhere as valid. But with this exception at least, to the rule; if the relation thus entered into elsewhere, although lawful in the foreign country, is stigmatized as incestuous by the law of Pennsylvania, no rule of comity requires a court sitting in this state to recognize the foreign marriage as valid. (Same as to polygamous marriages.) Because a continuance of the marriage would expose the parties to indictment in the criminal court. See *United States v. Rodgers*, 109 Federal, 886.

registrar; when such do take place they are valid. (1 Bishop M. & D., pp. 423, 436.)

Nor do they fall in the category of marriages prohibited by Jewish law and allowed by our statutes, although the contrary is true in England. Thus a marriage to a divorcee during her sister's lifetime, or of a Cohan to a divorcee.

Perhaps these marriages of near kin, so popular among Jews in all lands, should be validated in leading Jewish centres, notably New York City, by the legislatures (for all citizens) as was done in England in 1847 (for Jews generally) in Maryland in 1860 and in Louisiana in 1904.

Rabbis should be warned also of going through the empty ceremony of marrying a second time a couple, who have journeyed for a lawful marriage either to hospitable Rhode Island or for first cousins to some neighboring State or Canada; though to gratify parents and hoodwink friends at home, this act may seem innocent enough. As good citizens they should neither violate nor abet nor sanction the violation of statutory laws. And with the possible mischief to innocents before them, they should not deliberately set aside the settled policy of the states they live in, which denounces such marriages as illegal.

The intermarriage of imbeciles, lunatics and others of defective faculties and of dependents and other derelicts, not allowed in some states, e. g., Wisconsin, I have not considered; nor have I taken up the second marriage of couples divorced, most states prohibiting such marriages for a shorter or longer period, while in the District of Columbia, the guilty party may never marry. This would lead me too far afield.

I do recommend for the purpose of ascertaining what are the laws of marriage that each rabbi procure through his congressman or from the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Special Report of the Census office (volume one) being the "Summary of Laws of Marriage and Divorce" (1909). The volume is full of exact information well arranged and in popular language and should be in every rabbi's library; it may be had for the asking. As nice and difficult questions concerning the law are constantly brought to the rabbi's attention, a safe rule to follow is: when in doubt consult a competent lawyer.

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

President Heller—A resolution has been offered, which will be read by the Secretary.

Resolved, That the Convention place itself on record as strongly condemning prize fights, as a relapse into habits of savagery, as promoting the al-

ready too prevalent gambling spirit and as a danger to public morals in general.

A. GUTTMACHER,
G. DEUTSCH,
K. KOHLER,
S. HECHT,
D. PHILIPSON.

The resolution was adopted.

President Heller next presented the report of the Committee on Free Distribution of Publications.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREE DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATIONS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your committee on systematic methods for distributing our publications commends for your adoption the following rules:

1. The matter of free distribution and special discounts is to be left to the discretion of the chairman of our Publication Committee.

2. Prayer Books are to be sold to Orphan Asylums, Hospitals and Old People's Homes at a discount of 40 per cent., carriage by them.

3. Prayer Books are to be loaned in reasonable quantities for summer services when some responsible person vouches for their being returned in good condition. This work shall be in charge of the Director of Synagog Extension; as far as possible its expenses shall be defrayed from a special fund to which its beneficiaries shall be asked to contribute.

4. Prayer Books are to be donated, upon proper application, to prisons and reformatories.

5. The Holiday Sermons are to be sent to only one individual in each of the congregations which desire to use them in public service. They shall be free also to individuals living far from any Jewish community.

6. Our tracts shall be sent free of cost in quantities proportionate to respective needs, upon official application by Jewish organizations, or in single copies to individuals under the authority of our Publication Committee.

7. Year books shall be sent free, upon proper application, to pupils and graduates of Jewish seminaries. Each member of the Conference may direct copies of the current year book to be sent free of mailing cost to five parties. There shall be no mailing charges to public or congregational libraries.

8. Reprints shall be sent free in single copies to our members, and to others desiring them.

9. The books received by the Conference in return for subventions are

to be offered as prizes in our seminaries in accordance with a plan on which the Publication Committee shall agree with the respective faculties.

10. The Publication Committee shall keep a record of loans and distributions which shall be indexed by the names of individuals applying, and institutions favored. In its annual report the committee shall give account, in a special column, of the extent each year of our distributions. The accounts of our summer service loans shall be kept and annually reported to the Conference by the Director of Synagog Extension.

MAX. HELLER, *Chairman*,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

DAVID PHILIPSON.

On motion, the report was received and referred to the Executive Committee with power to act.

Chairman Morgenstern presented the report of the Committee on Solicitation of Funds.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION OF FUNDS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: At the recent Conference in New York City it was unanimously decided to appoint a Committee on Solicitation of Funds. This committee was to combine the soliciting activities of the Relief, Tract, and Bible Funds committees, in order, on the one hand, to prevent a duplication of appeal to the public on the part of the Conference, and on the other hand to approach the public in what seemed the most dignified, and at the same time most effective way. This committee was to consist of the President, Corresponding Secretary, Treasurer, and chairmen of the Committees on Relief, Tract, and Bible Funds. Later it was found advisable to add the Recording Secretary to this committee. Contributions were to be distributed equally between the three funds, unless otherwise designated by the donor.

Owing to the fact that the New York Conference was held in November, that in consequence committees were necessarily appointed late, and that in view of the important, yet at the same time, delicate work assigned to this committee, it was indispensable that it meet in personal conference to formulate its plans, before proceeding to actual work.

Your committee has now carefully considered various plans of procedure, and has come to the conclusion that notwithstanding the importance of its work, and the value of immediate and constant activity, it is the part of wisdom to proceed slowly, and above all, systematically. The advisability of appeal by extensive individual circularization is open to question, because of the inherent cost and doubtful success of this method. Accord-

ingly, your committee deems it best, for the present at least, to rely entirely upon an appeal to congregations.

We recommend, therefore, that

I. A strong appeal, addressed to congregations, be sent to the members of this Conference and the officers and individual members of their boards, asking that in the annual congregational budget, provision be made for contributions to the Relief and Tract Funds of the Conference. The members of the Conference are urged to follow up this appeal before their boards, and urge the importance of this item in the annual budget.

II. Inasmuch as the Bible Fund is only a temporary matter, which will be completed when a certain fixed sum will have been raised, the members of the Conference shall be requested to assume the initiative in individual efforts to raise as large sums as possible in their respective congregations.

III. We endorse the recommendation of the Finance Committee that on the inside cover of all tracts to be published in the future, be printed a statement of the purpose of these tracts, and soliciting donations to the Tract Fund.

IV. We also endorse the recommendation of the Tract Committee that our members, wherever opportunity offers, urge that donations and bequests be made to the Relief and Tract Funds, along with other charities.

V. Donations to these funds should follow the same method of receipt and acknowledgment, as all other items of income of the Conference.

In conclusion, your committee begs to assure the Conference of its conviction that this work can, and will be established upon a firm and efficient basis, and in consequence the activities and usefulness of the Conference furthered in many ways.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, *Chairman*,
A. GUTTMACHER,
MAX. HELLER,
M. J. GRIES,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
DAVID MARX,
JOS. STOLZ.

On motion, the report was received and referred to the Executive Committee, with power to act.

Rabbi George Zepin presented the report of the Committee on Summer Congregations.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUMMER CONGREGATIONS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your committee appointed to formulate plans for organizing summer congregations, begs to report as follows:

There are three kinds of summer resorts, each presenting a different problem. The summer resort where there is a large Jewish permanent population, like Atlantic City, forms a class that is well able to solve its own problems. The summer resorts and health resorts, like Petoskey and Battle Creek, where the resident population is too small to build a temple or hold public services, form a second class. The temporary cottagers and hotel colonies at points where there are no Jewish residents, form a third class.

At one and all of these resorts a great deal depends upon the temper of the Jews that visit the place. They must bring along with them the desire to visit a house of worship. This desire must be awakened at home, long before they come to the summering resort. However, a great deal may be accomplished at these places by an energetic local organization. At the resorts where the resident population is small and the visiting population large, it may be possible, after some years of effort, to establish a temple and conduct services during the summer season. This, I am told, is the practice at certain European watering places, like Wiesbaden. In America, at Long Branch, N. J., there is the Beth Miriam Congregation, which is similarly organized. The utmost that can be done at temporary summering places is to establish services conducted by laymen, and by ministers, wherever possible.

In answer to a circular letter sent out by the Department of Synagog and School Extension, the names of fifty summer resorts were suggested as favorite places with the Jewish people. It is manifestly impossible to send organizers to and establish congregations at all of these places. The utmost that we can do is to awaken the Jewish conscience, not only at the summer resorts, but before the people start out for their summer vacations, so that the Jews who frequent these summer resorts may, of their own accord, organize summer congregations. We therefore make the following recommendations:

1. That the Conference Secretary issue a letter every year to the rabbinate urging them to preach on the subject, and to point out to their congregations that it is the duty of laymen to maintain services at summer resorts.

2. That the Central Conference of American Rabbis co-operate in the following manner with the Department of Synagog and School Extension for the purpose of establishing one or two "model" summer congregations. The purpose of establishing these two congregations would be to demonstrate that such can be organized and maintained. This co-operation shall take the form of a grant of three hundred and fifty paper-bound Friday Evening and Saturday Morning Service manuals, which shall be sold for the Conference or given away, as the occasion may require. The Conference can further co-operate with the Department of Synagog and School Extension by securing the services of a certain number of rabbis who will preach

at these two summer congregations. The Department of Synagog and School Extension holds itself in readiness to send an organizer to two summer resorts, secure a hall for services, print cards for distribution at the hotels announcing the services, and to do whatever is necessary to organize choirs and arouse enthusiasm.

3. That the chairman of the incoming committee on Summer Congregations, carrying out the plan of arousing public sentiment regarding this matter, shall gather all information about the progress of summer congregations in any part of the United States, and send this information periodically to the Jewish press.

Respectfully submitted,
 GEORGE ZEPIN, *Chairman*,
 W. H. FINESHRIBER,
 S. HECHT.

On motion, the report was received and referred to the Executive Committee for favorable action.

The report of the Committee on Personal Prayers was next read.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PERSONAL PRAYERS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

A committee appointed by you to draft a series of "personal prayers for various occasions in life," beg leave to submit a report in galley-proof form. The committee has conscientiously carried out the instructions received at the last session of the Conference at New York City.

A communication was sent to each member, together with a printed page-proof of the work done, requesting that all revisions and suggestions be sent to the secretary of the committee not later than February 1, 1910. This request brought exactly ten replies from our entire membership. The committee found itself thereby enlarged by an increase of ten additional members.

The work was gone over very thoroughly by the chairman and the secretary, with the assistance of Rabbi Landman, and with the approval of Rabbi Salzman. All revisions made were the result of careful and earnest study.

The committee having now completed its work, asks to be discharged as soon as the little booklet shall have been put through the press.

Respectfully submitted,
 HENRY BERKOWITZ, *Chairman*,
 ELI MAYER, *Secretary*,
 ISAAC LANDMAN,
 MARCUS SALZMAN.

Rabbi Harris—I move that the Committee be not discharged, but that all members of the Conference read this pamphlet carefully, and send further recommendations to the Committee, and that the Committee report at the next Conference, with the advantage of these revisions. Then I think we will be prepared to discharge them with thanks, and print a booklet, but not now.

Rabbi Landman—The last Conference instructed us to correct the galley proofs in accordance with the suggestions received; to have it set up in the form of the Union Prayer Book, and to make a final report at this Conference. All this we have done. If we send these manuscripts out again we will have exactly the same results as before. If one or more members of the Conference did not receive the report of last year, it probably miscarried. We will probably receive two or three more replies, and the matter will be delayed for another year.

Rabbi Kornfeld—Simply because all the members have not sent in their corrections, should not justify us in publishing something that should be omitted or corrected. . . . I find corrections necessary on the first and second pages.

Rabbi Kohler—I have spoken to a number of the colleagues here who agree with me that there is at least one benediction here that can not be accepted. It is a new benediction, and is absolutely without the Hebrew flavor. Many other benedictions that ought to be in are missing.

Rabbi Gries—This new galley proof should be sent to every member of the Conference, and the time should be fixed for receiving suggestions, say January 1st, and the Committee should be given power to go ahead. The Committee can be enlarged, if necessary.

Rabbi Harris—I move that the report be referred back to the committee, with instructions to report next year, when it shall be made the first order of business, and that copies of this report and this resolution be sent to all members, who shall be given until the first of January to return manuscripts with suggestions.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Vice-President S. Schulman presiding.

Rabbi Joseph Stolz presented the report of the Committee on President's Message.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on President's Message begs leave to report as follows:

1. We congratulate the President upon his successful administration, and with him rejoice in the steady and increasing growth and progress of Reform Judaism in America. We agree that Reform was inevitable. And we, too, have "an abiding conviction that the Reform movement, the product of inevitable historic forces, is a legitimate growth on the parent stem, and is bound to extend to ever larger numbers as modern civilization, at its best, expands its realms." It is a matter of particular gratification to note the spread of the liberal spirit in Europe, and we again send our greetings to the workers in London, Berlin, Paris, Melbourne, Buda Pest, and St. Petersburg, and wish them abundant success in the effective and healthy adaptation of the principles and ideals of Reform Judaism to their respective needs.

2. The Geiger Centenary offered a splendid opportunity for voicing the appreciation of the American Reform Jew of the life and work of that great protagonist of the Liberal Movement in Germany. Our Geiger Memorial Exercises, consisting of addresses on the pre-Geiger and post-Geiger movements, a study of Geiger as Reformer, and the reading of his classical letter to his son (see Geiger's *Lebenswerk*), have brought us closer in spirit to the times, life, and the heroic labors of this pioneer, and impose upon us a new responsibility and obligation to keep alive his spirit in our land. Wherefore, we recommend, that the matter of publishing a Geiger Memorial Volume be referred to the Executive Committee for its favorable consideration.

3. We unite with the President in his hearty welcome extended Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, and we congratulate the Executive Committee and the Conference, no less than the whole of American Israel upon the fortunate visit to this country, of this distinguished exponent of the Liberal Movement in England. We recognize that he has come to us from a great distance, and at a heavy sacrifice. He has delivered to us his message of hope and encouragement. We have been thrilled by his personality. We have touched hands with him, and we find that his coming to us has been an inspiration. Whatever reports of our work he may take back with him, we are happy in the conviction that his presence here has strengthened our hands and heartened our spirits. We bid him God-speed back to his home, praying that many more years of health and mental and spiritual vigor be granted him to continue his noble labors in behalf of Israel. We recommend that the Executive Committee be instructed to prepare and transmit some fitting testimonial of our grateful appreciation of his presence and message to us, and for his distinguished services to Judaism and Israel at large.

4. The President's message emphasizes Israel's religious mission and that it is our duty to convey our beliefs and convictions unto others. In this work of propaganda, however, the congregations have thus far assumed very little financial responsibility. Worthy causes looking to the furtherance of Judaism, such as the preparation and free distribution of tracts, the publication of a Journal for Young Israel, the translation of the Bible, the Hebrew Union College, ought to make their strongest appeal for support to the conscience of congregations. Congregations should feel it their duty to set aside regularly as a part of their annual budget, funds for the propaganda of Judaism and the support of institutions of Jewish learning. We recommend that every rabbi in this Conference bring the imperativeness of this obligation to the consideration of his congregation as frequently as possible, and especially that he utilize the Sabbath preceding the annual meeting of his congregation, or some Sabbath as he may consider more advisable, to bring home to his congregation as a community, and to the members as individuals, their obligation to the missionary responsibility of American Israel.

5. The committee expresses its hearty approval of the action of the Committee on Synagog and School Extension, of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, not only in the publication of Young Israel, but in its determination to make of it a Sabbath-School Journal. And we would further show our appreciation by setting aside a provisional subsidy of \$500, which shall only be called for if the Union of American Hebrew Congregations should not succeed on or before May, 1911, in disposing of the 3,000 subscriptions which it has underwritten.

6. We endorse the strong suggestion of the President that the time has come for the Conference to widen its sphere of active work by preparing and publishing text books for our religious schools. This new policy would tend to raise the standard of religious methods of education in our Sabbath-Schools; secure more efficient methods of instruction; and create a greater uniformity in text books and materials. And we recommend that the Executive Committee appoint a Religious School Text-Book Commission to work out a plan for the execution of these purposes.

7. Russia's inhuman treatment of the Jew fills us with horror. While we hold in contempt all such indications of hatred and tyranny, we are more than proud to record every instance of advancing sympathy and friendliness with the life and hope of the Jew. The denunciation of Russia's treatment of the Jew by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of America, and by other large bodies of our Christian brethren, fills us with heartiest appreciation of their good wishes, and we

welcome these and similar expressions of good will as assurances of the dawn of a brighter day.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH STOLZ, *Chairman*,
A. SIMON, *Secretary*,
S. SCHULMAN,
K. KOHLER,
T. SCHANFABBER,
A. J. MESSING,
WM. FRIEDMAN,
S. HECHT,
M. J. GRIES,
GEORGE ZEPIN.

On motion, the report was received and the recommendations taken up seriatim.

Recommendations I, II, III and IV were adopted without debate.

Recommendation V was read.

Rabbi Franklin—In connection with this matter, I would like to remind the Conference that we are under a moral obligation to the widow of the former publisher of "Young Israel." This obligation we should meet.

Rabbi Stern—I move that the paragraph of the report be adopted, and that the feature of it referring to the provisional subsidy of \$500, together with the obligations referred to by Rabbi Franklin, be referred to the Executive Committee for action.

Carried.

Rabbi Stolz—I move that a copy of the first part of this resolution be sent to the officers of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and also to Young Israel.

Seconded and carried.

Recommendation VI was read.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I believe the report has gone a little too far. Before we can enter upon the publication of text-books and appoint a Sabbath-school Commission to go ahead with this work, we ought to consider a little more carefully the propriety and the feasibility of this Conference entering upon the text-book business. I therefore move to strike out the last words of the paragraph and substitute "that the Committee on Religious Education be instructed to

consider the advisability and feasibility of this Conference publishing text-books."

Rabbi Philipson—I second the amendment.

Rabbi Stolz—That simply delays the matter for another year, or puts it in the hands of the Sabbath-school Commission, or in the hands of the Committee on Religious Education. The question is shall we appoint a Sabbath-school Commission to consider this particular question, or shall we leave it to the Religious School Committee?

Rabbi Morgenstern—There are two points to be considered, first, the advisability of referring this matter to a separate committee or to the Religious School Committee, and the second, the necessity of considering the advisability and feasibility of the Conference undertaking the publishing of text-books. I would like to speak on the two matters separately. First, the question does after all fall within the province of the Religious School Committee. We have a most efficient Religious School Committee, and while we know that it is very busy, nevertheless, because it is so efficient I think we can feel assured that it would look after this additional work well. In the second place, the question as to the advisability and feasibility of publishing text-books; we have just heard from Rabbi Zepin that the Union of Hebrew Congregations is considering very seriously the preparation and publication of text-books for Jewish Sabbath-schools; we have just heard from him also that there is no money for this purpose, and that it is a hazardous financial undertaking. If it had been a good financial proposition a book company would have taken hold of it long ago. Furthermore, there is the serious difficulty of finding proper Jewish text-book writers. This is a business proposition, and I question the advisability of this Conference committing itself to this without a full realization of the difficulties, financial and otherwise.

Rabbi Heller—When I first recommended to the Conference the preparation of Sabbath-School text-books, of course I did not expect that it would at once say: "We shall appoint three or five men who will write text-books, and we shall publish them in our own name;" I did not think myself altogether original in the proposition—the

writing of new text-books seems to be in the air just now, more probably than ever before, in the history of American Judaism. I know that a number of national bodies are considering the writing of text-books for the use of Sabbath-Schools in a manner that is new. We have not one solitary religious school text-book published by any national body, with the possible exception of the Sabbath-School leaflets. The time seems to have come for some national body to undertake this. We have been asked: "Why don't you write certain text-books?" and the reply has been: "Lack of time or the disposition for it." But inasmuch as no book written by any individual has yet proved acceptable to any large number of Jewish Sabbath-Schools, and inasmuch as I fear that the situation will continue and any book that may come out over the name of any individual will find it difficult to obtain general acceptance, I am waiting until some authoritative body shall bring out such a volume. Which one of the various national Jewish bodies, that take an interest in Jewish education, is best fitted to accomplish such a task? Which one of these bodies has within its membership, under its control, the largest number of men that are competent to judge the fitness of such a task? No Jewish body in this country contains within its folds a larger number of Jewish educators, a larger number of men who are competent to judge of the fitness of the Sabbath-School text-book, than the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Furthermore, the price of our prayer books stands in the way of purchase by congregations and individuals, on a large scale, and hinders a number of commendable things in our congregational life. If we succeed in writing text-books which shall be widely and generally adopted, we shall open to this Conference a large and thoroughly legitimate source of revenue. And finally, uniformity of text-books in the Sabbath-Schools is highly desirable. When we consider how very frequently people move from town to town, and how difficult it is to classify children coming from other towns, I feel that if we have a uniformity of religious school text-books, it would be well. And if the religious school books we adopt should prove unfitting in one or the other respect, we are here to correct and amend and revise them, just as we are here to correct and amend

and revise the prayer book in whatever respect it may prove unfit. For my part, I had nothing to do with the proposition of appointing a special Sabbath-School Text-Book Commission. I have very great confidence in the capacity of our Sabbath-School Committee and believe it has done excellent work.

Rabbi Morgenstern—It is a matter of great regret to differ with a superior officer, but I find myself compelled to do so. I fear the President has altogether an erroneous conception of the way in which text-books come into existence. You can not appoint a man to write text-books and then have the Conference pass upon them. No competent man will write a text-book and have eighty men consider it and pass upon it. You will never get a text-book in that way. A text-book writer is born and not made. I doubt if there be more than three or four men in this Conference who can write a good text-book based upon scientific principles. Consequently, if we are going to commit ourselves to the policy of preparing text-books we will be compelled to go outside of this Conference to find men to write them. Now, I submit that if three national bodies are considering this very matter, what is the use of a fourth body doing so? One body has already definitely committed itself to this proposition. Even should all do so, the method of procedure must be the same. They will have to search for suitable text-book writers and they will probably rely on the same persons. And there will be no question of one body, such as ours, adopting those books by a majority vote or in any other way. Furthermore, while I realize the value of uniformity of text-books, nevertheless, I consider it desirable only to a secondary degree. We have a great many public schools, and they have no uniform system of text-books, nevertheless very efficient work is done. There is considerable uniformity of text-books already in our Sabbath-Schools. Accordingly, in spite of the argument presented, forcible as it is, I still believe that the question is open, and requires very serious consideration, whether this Conference is at the present moment willing to commit itself definitely to this policy of going into the text-book business. If you adopt this resolution, as I understand it, you mean to say that this Conference is resolved to publish text-books and you appoint a com-

mittee with instructions to find out how to publish them. If, however, you reject this resolution you have deferred consideration of the question whether it is advisable to publish text-books until you know that you are ready to go ahead with the work.

Rabbi Gries—Both as chairman of the Committee on Religious Education and also as a member of the Committee on the President's Message that reported favorably on this proposition, I wish to speak. There is one point in my mind as to whether it is within the province of the Religious Education Committee, or whether it comes within the province of the Sabbath-School Commission. The reason the phrase Sabbath-School Commission was used was because Rabbis Simon and Zepin urged that resolution before the President's Message Committee . . . and because of the well-known process of the development of text-books by the other great churches. The Episcopal Church particularly, and the Methodist Church and the Baptist, all of them have organized bodies for developing a series of text-books for their own work. The intention of the committee was not that we should commit the Conference to the publication of the books as much as it was that a Commission should be appointed to study the problem and to work out the whole proposition and report back to this Conference from time to time. As far as I am concerned, as present chairman of the Religious Education Committee, it is immaterial whether it is the Religious School Committee or the Sabbath-School Commission that shall do the work. I think we should be in accord with the thought of the President, that this is an important need and the Conference is the body under which this important work should be inaugurated and also in accordance with the thought of the Secretary, namely, that the Commission should merely study the problem, present its report, and then we can decide upon the things involved therein. For the sake of clearness might I not ask the mover to accept this form, either the Sabbath-School Commission or the Religious Education Committee, shall present a report to the next Conference concerning a plan for the preparation, publication, etc., carrying out the provisions of the resolution. That strikes out the last part of your paragraph.

Rabbi Morgenstern—Very well.

The amendment was defeated. The original motion was put and carried.

Recommendation VII was adopted.

The report of the Committee on President's Message was then unanimously adopted as a whole.

President Heller in the Chair.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your committee reports as follows:

1. The revision of the Union Prayer Book: The subject of the revision of the Union Prayer Book has been considered at a number of previous Conferences. In reporting upon this matter to this Conference, your committee begs to state that inasmuch as the Union Prayer Book represents the theology of the Conference, it should remain intact so far; but that certain modifications in the diction and in the translation are needed such as only could have been discovered through experience in the use of the book; that, therefore, a revision committee to make needed revisions be appointed, who shall also consider the expense involved in such work as repairing the Hebrew plates and making new ones, and report in full at the next Conference.

2. As to the recommendation that the scripture readings presented at the last Conference be deferred until the publication of the new Bible translation, the committee recommends that the actual selections, as prepared by the Scripture Committee in the final form now in our hands, after many revisions at many conferences, be herewith accepted as the scripture readings of the Union Prayer Book, but that the new translation of the Bible now in preparation be used for these readings, and the whole be referred to the Committee on Revision of the Prayer Book, as to the best mode of incorporating them in the revised edition.

3. We accept the offer of Rabbi Zepin to assist in the distribution of Conference Sermons, and recommend that he be requested to send out at the Conference's expense 1,000 return postal cards to find out if a new edition of Holiday Sermons is necessary, and also as to the number required.

4. We recommend that the stiff Morocco bindings being no longer in demand, be discontinued.

5. The committee does not concur in the recommendation to place the volumes of Sermons by American Rabbis on the free list.

6. We suggest that the 13 copies of Ehrlich's *Die Psalmen* and the 25 copies of his *Randglossen* be not placed in the market for sale, but presented to the Hebrew Union College for distribution among the students in such a way as its authorities may determine upon.

7. The committee concur in the recommendation that a new edition of the Haggadah be authorized, the number to be left to the Executive Committee.

8. It concurs in printing a new edition of the Union Hymnal, the number to be left to the Executive Committee.

9. It also concurs in the printing of a new edition of Vols. I and II of the Union Prayer Book and the Week Day Service, the details to be determined by the Executive Committee.

10. It does not approve the increasing of the price of the Sabbath Evening and Morning Service Book to fifty cents.

11. Inasmuch, however, as the sale of this book discourages the use of the complete book, Vol. I of the Union Prayer Book, containing Festival Services, it recommends that the issue of the smaller book be discontinued, the copies still remaining to be used for free distribution to institutions through the Executive Committee.

12. It endorses the following plan proposed by Rabbi Zepin of disposing of a large number of Vol. II of the Union Prayer Book: That a reply postal card be issued to congregations, asking whether two or more copies of the Holiday Prayer Book be sent to them on memorandum, with the understanding that if the seal of the book is unbroken, it may be returned. The Conference to bear the expense of the postal, and also of expressage on such books one way.

13. The committee recommends the renewal of the contract with the Bloch Publishing Company on the same terms as last year.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID PHILIPSON, *Chairman*,
MAURICE H. HARRIS,
JULIAN MORGENSTERN,
DAVID LEFKOWITZ,
TOBIAS SHANFARBER,
JOSEPH STOLZ.

The report was received and adopted seriatim and as a whole.

The following amendment to the By-Laws was offered and adopted by the necessary two-thirds vote:

The undersigned propose the following change in the By-Laws of the Central Conference, namely, that the second half of Section 2, Article III, reading as follows:

"One-half of the net profits accruing from all publications of the Con-

ference authorized by the Executive Board, shall be placed to the credit of the Relief Fund,"
be stricken out.

GEORGE ZEPIN, *Chairman*,
I. E. MARCUSON,
M. NEWFIELD.

The following report of the Committee on Resolutions was next read by its chairman, Rabbi David Lefkowitz:

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

I. Your Committee on Resolutions concurs most heartily in the suggestion of the Committee on Contemporaneous History that the members of the Conference be requested to send their own publications, and those of others, to the Midrash Abarbanel in Jerusalem, and that they assist this noble institution by their active interest.

II. The recommendation of the Committee on Contemporaneous History that \$2,000 be raised by the members of the Conference to defray the expenses of publishing one volume of Ben Jehuda's Hebrew Dictionary, is not concurred in by your committee.

III. It recommends that the following be referred to the Executive Committee, with power to act, namely: the purchase of six copies of Ben Jehuda's work, subscription to Eisenstein's Hebrew Encyclopedia, and the purchase of ten copies of Midrash Rabba, edited by J. Theodore, all of these to be placed in the Hebrew Union College Library.

IV. Recognizing that the condition of our unfortunate brethren in Russia has not improved, that unless unforeseen changes occur in the political situation there, the fate of six million Jews in Russia will continue to be a source of the gravest concern, we feel as though some effort should be made to arouse the national conscience in this matter. It is therefore recommended that the Conference, through the Executive Committee, request its members to set aside Shabbath Zachor for a sermon and special prayer on the condition of the Jews in lands of oppression, and to give the event the necessary publicity in the press; and that the resolution to invite various representative bodies in American Jewry to take the necessary steps leading to an intervention on behalf of the Jews of Russia by the United States and other governments, be referred to the Executive Committee; that our government be requested to continue its good offices in securing the amelioration of these conditions, and that this resolution be sent to our government in Washington.

V. We heartily concur in the resolution that the members of the Con-

ference urge the members of their congregations and their friends who go to Europe and provide themselves with passports to demand a vise from the Russian consul, and in each case in which the vise is denied, to lodge complaint with the Department of State, and invoke the aid of their congressman and the senators of the State.

VI. We consider that the resolution¹ which calls upon the Conference to devise ways and means for the publication of a leaflet setting forth such historical and statistical data which shall refute the most current slanders of the American Jew concerning their patriotic service, brings up a most important subject; and we recommend that action in this matter be referred to the Committee on Church and State, in whose province the subject lies.

VII. Your committee concurs in the resolution² that it is the policy of the Conference that no papers be read if the writers thereof are not in attendance at the Conference. It does not, however, consider it advisable to pass the resolution authorizing the Executive Committee to pay the expenses to the Conference of any member on the program who can not meet such expense.

VIII. Your committee recommends that the following resolutions³ be transmitted to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations:

"Resolved, that the C. C. A. R. notes with gratification and extreme pleasure the renewed activity of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in the extension field, and the return of Rabbi George Zepin to the work of Director of Synagogue and School Extension, which he inau-

¹In view of frequent attacks made on the good name of the Jews, who are presented by narrow minded bigots as recently arrived immigrants, living on mere toleration, as drones of society, as having a disproportionately large number of criminals and profligates, and in other ways defaming Jews and Judaism, particularly by the declaration that their exercise of political rights is a concession granted to them by kindness, be it

Resolved, That this Conference devise ways and means for the publication of a leaflet, setting forth such historical and statistical data which shall refute the most current attacks and slanders, and that the Committee on Church and State, in connection with the director of the Department of Synagogue School Extension be authorized to undertake this publication, and to devise ways and means for its distribution.

G. DEUTSCH,
A. BRILL,
H. J. WOLF,
J. MIELZINER.

²*Resolved*, That is it the sense of the Conference that no paper be read if the writer thereof is not in attendance upon the Conference.

H. G. ENELOW,
M. J. GRIES.

³WHEREAS, It is desirable to have the writers of papers present at the Convention to read and discuss their papers; and

WHEREAS, It may happen that the burden of expense may be too great for some of our members; be it

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be empowered to pay the traveling expenses of writers of papers, if necessary, in their discretion.

JOS. STOLZ,
DAVID PHILIPSON.

gured so auspiciously seven years ago; and it confidently looks forward to his increasing usefulness in this field; and be it

"Resolved, that it concurs most heartily in his plan of improving Young Israel so that it become a real and vital force in religious school endeavor."

The resolution "that this Conference appropriate \$500 toward the Young Israel Endeavor, as a guarantee fund, to be used only if the Union of American Hebrew Congregations does not collect its \$3,000 subscription for which it has pledged itself," it suggests be referred to the Finance Committee.

IX. The committee does not concur in the resolution⁴ for the establishment of a Labor Bureau of the C. C. A. R.

X. The resolution⁵ for the establishment of a Sabbath-School Commission treats of a subject touched upon in the President's message, and as the Committee on President's Message will report this matter, we deem it unnecessary to make recommendation.

XI. The committee does not approve of the resolution⁶ to prepare and publish a separate children's service for the Day of Atonement.

³Resolved, That the Central Conference of American Rabbis notes with gratification and extreme pleasure the renewed activity of the U. A. H. C. in the extension field, and the return of Rabbi George Zepin to the work of Director of Synagogue and School Extension which he inaugurated so auspiciously seven years ago, and it confidently looks forward to his increasing usefulness in this field; and

Resolved, That it concurs most heartily in his plan of improving Young Israel so that it become a real and vital aid in religious school endeavors; and further be it

Resolved, That this Conference appropriate \$500 towards the endeavor as a guarantee fund, to be used only if the U. A. H. C. does not collect its \$3,000 subscription for which it has pledged itself.

ISAAC LANDMAN,
I. AARON,
WM. S. FRIEDMAN,
S. H. GOLDENSON,
S. HECHT,
M. H. HARRIS,
NATHAN STERN.

⁴Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to investigate the subject, "The Workingman in the Synagogue." This committee shall be known as the Labor Bureau of the C. C. A. R. Its duties shall be defined by the Executive Committee.

SOLOMON FOSTER,
M. H. HARRIS,
JOS. STOLZ,
ABRAM SIMON,
K. KOHLER,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
MORRIS NEWFIELD.

⁵In accordance with the report of the chairman of the Committee on Religious Education, be it

Resolved, That the C. C. A. R., through the chairman of the Committee on Religious Education, call a meeting of the Representatives of the Chautauqua Society, the New York Teacher's College, the Department of Synagogue and School Extension, the Cincinnati Teacher's College, and such other bodies as are engaged in the production of Sabbath School Literature, for the purpose of creating a Jewish Sabbath School Commission; be it further

Resolved, That this Sabbath School Commission apply itself to a study of methods of work in use and also to the creation of Sabbath School Literature.

ABRAM SIMON,
LEO. M. FRANKLIN,
GEORGE ZEPIN.

⁶Believing that the spiritual needs of the children on the Day of Atonement have thus far been neglected, and believing further that the preparation of a

XII. It recommends the resolution⁷ requesting Dr. Deutsch to collect, revise and edit his response as printed by him in the American Israelite, with the view of publishing them in the forthcoming Year Book.

XIII. To this committee was referred the rewording of the amendment to the Constitution as to persons eligible for membership in our Conference. To this effect we propose an amendment to change Article III, Section 1, of the Constitution to read: "Professors of rabbinical seminaries, active and retired rabbis who are graduates of a rabbinical seminary, and ministers, not graduates of a rabbinical seminary, who have been for five years in the ministry and three consecutive years been performing the functions of a rabbi in one and the same congregation shall be eligible to membership."

XIV. All applications for membership shall be acted upon by the Executive Board.

XV. We concur most heartily in the resolution⁸ that the Conference send a bon voyage message to Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, who sails on the Wilhelm II. Tuesday.

Respectfully submitted,

D. LEFKOWITZ, *Chairman*,
FRED. COHEN,
S. DEINARD,
S. KORY,
M. LOVITCH,
D. MARX,
I. RYPINS,
L. WITT.

Recommendations I, II, III, IV, V, VIII, X, XIII, XIV and XV were adopted.

Recommendation VI was referred to the Committee on Church and State for report at next Conference.

children's service for that day to satisfy such needs should be the work of the Conference; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference take steps to have such a service prepared and published.

JOS. S. KORNFIELD,
M. NEWFIELD,
DAVID LEFKOWITZ,
L. J. ROTHSTEIN,
LOUIS WITT,
LEO. M. FRANKLIN.

**Resolved*, That Dr. Deutsch, chairman of the Committee on Responses, be requested to collect and edit the Responses as printed by him in the American Israelite, and have them published in the forthcoming Year Book as a part of the report of the committee.

JOS. STOLZ,
DAVID LEFKOWITZ.

**Resolved*, That the Conference send a "bon voyage" message to Mr. C. G. Montefiore, who sails on the Wilhelm II, Tuesday.

ISAAC LANDMAN,
DAVID PHILIPSON.

Recommendation IX was amended to read: "That a standing committee be appointed, which shall be called the Committee on Synagog and Labor."

Recommendations XI and XII were referred to the Executive Committee.

The report of the Committee on Thanks was presented by Rabbi Hecht, chairman:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THANKS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN—Although this twenty-first meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis has been held practically in the privacy of its own circle, it has been brightened by acts of kindly consideration and thoughtful courtesy on the part of men and women outside of the Conference, to whom we feel that a debt of gratitude is due. We, therefore, desire to make public acknowledgment of those courtesies and attentions received.

Our thanks are due, in the first place, and freely tendered to our honored President, who with fine tact and absolute fairness conducted the deliberations of our Conference, and by his dignity contributed in no small degree to the harmony and good-will that characterized our sessions.

We desire to convey our sense of grateful appreciation to Mrs. Jonas Hiller, of New Orleans, by whose thoughtful courtesy our improvised temple at the Sabbath Evening and Morning Services was florally decorated.

To Mrs. D. Lefkowitz, of Dayton, Ohio, we are deeply indebted for the contribution she has made to the impressiveness and beauty of our services by her pleasing and artistic rendition of sacred songs during the same.

We desire to thank the Temple Beth El of Detroit for the loan of the Scroll of the Torah.

To the Associated Press we make due acknowledgment of the fairness with which it reported the proceedings of the Conference; likewise to the National Vaudette Film Co. of Detroit, for its courtesy in offering the Conference an exhibition of its moving pictures.

To the management of "The Inn," we express our sincere appreciation for the uniform kindness and attention shown to members of the Conference, and for their readiness to accommodate them in every way possible.

And finally, we desire to record our high sense of gratitude to Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, who not only brought the sacrifice involved in his coming to the Conference to deliver his inspiring message, but who faithfully attended every session, and by his presence at and participation in our deliberations, contributed largely towards making this twenty-first Convention of the

Central Conference of American Rabbis one of the most notable in the history of the organization.

Respectfully submitted,

A. HECHT, *Chairman*,
DAVID ALEXANDER,
LOUIS WITT,
M. MESSING.

The report was adopted unanimously by a rising vote.

President Heller—We now have the report of the Committee on Nominations.

Rabbi Franklin—This has been called the committee on heart-burns. I want to say in preface to the report of our committee that we have tried to serve the best interests of the Conference in our deliberations. I have some reason to be hesitant about presenting at least one of the names on this committee in this report, and you may judge of it yourselves when I come to it, but it has been by the unanimous consent of the committee, except for myself. In all other respects the report of the committee is unanimous.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS.

Your Committee on Nominations submits the following names for your consideration:

<i>Honorary President</i>	Kaufman Kohler
<i>President</i>	Maximilian Heller
<i>Vice-President</i>	Samuel Schulman
<i>Treasurer</i>	Moses J. Gries
<i>Recording Secretary</i>	Julian Morgenstern
<i>Corresponding Secretary</i>	Ephraim Frisch

Executive Committee:

Israel Aaron,	William Fineshriber,
Wm. Friedman,	Leo N. Franklin,
Maurice Harris,	David Lefkowitz,
David Philipson,	David Marx,
Isaac Rypins,	Joseph Stolz.
Louis Witt,	

Respectfully submitted,

L. M. FRANKLIN, <i>Chairman</i> ,	S. GOLDENSON,
A. BRILL,	A. GUTTMACHER,
H. ETTIELSON,	M. RAISIN,
W. FINESHRIBER,	N. STERN.

On motion, duly seconded,

The Secretary cast the unanimous ballot of the Convention for the officers nominated by the Nominating Committee. The same course was pursued with reference to the nominations for the Executive Committee.

The following amendment to the Constitution was offered:

Resolved, that Article VI, Section 3, of the Constitution be amended so as to read:

"No member of the Conference shall be elected as an Executive member of the Board for more than three terms successively. This shall not be construed to apply to membership on the Board in virtue of service as President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer of the Conference."

It was moved and seconded that the question of time and place of the next Conference be referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Kaufman Kohler pronounced the benediction and the President declared the Twenty-first Conference closed.

SUMMARY.

Fifty-four members were in attendance.

A memorial address was delivered in honor of Prof. Sigmund Mannheimer. Kaddish was recited in memory of Professor Mannheimer and Rabbi B. A. Bonnheim.

Communications of congratulation and fellowship were reported as having been sent to the Liberal Jewish Societies abroad and their cordial replies acknowledged.

Favorable responses were received from the U. A. H. C. to the request of the Conference for co-operation in establishing religious services at summer resorts.

Both the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Theological Seminary replied favorably to the requests for providing instruction in sociology for the students and for establishing courses for those who desire to work amongst deaf mutes.

The National Conference of Jewish Charities agrees to furnish the public with an accurate statement of Jewish institutions in Palestine worthy of support.

During the past year Conference publications were sent, upon request, to South Africa, Australia, Honolulu, England, Russia, Holland and other parts of Continental Europe.

Jewish prisoners within penal institutions were provided with the Union Prayer Book and received religious help from members of the Conference.

As a result of the appeal made on Sabbath Zachor, \$463.49 were sent to the Alliance Israelite, in commemoration of its fiftieth anniversary. Sabbath Zachor was again designated as the day upon which appeal is to be made for the same society.

Not a single case was referred to the Committee on Arbitration. It was decided that the next circular sent to congregations and rabbis refer to this committee and its duties.

Two hundred and seventy-eight congregations and twenty Jewish institutions are now using the Union Prayer Book.

The Lyceum Bureau reported good work done. In some instances, through its endeavors, lectures on Jewish subjects were substituted for miscellaneous, and at times unworthy, entertainments. Hereafter the Bureau will advertise through the Jewish press. Lecture circuits are to be established.

A new pamphlet of Sermons was ordered published for distribution at the Holy Day Season to smaller congregations and communities without a rabbi. The Conference and the Board of Synagogue and School Extension will co-operate in this work.

The Committee on Hymnal reported decided progress. All rabbis and the

Jewish public and press are appealed to, to send in suitable hymn texts. The committee was authorized to arrange with competent individuals, cantors and other musicians for appropriate musical settings.

The death of Prof. Charles Gross, of Harvard, was lamented and memorial resolutions were adopted.

The congratulations of the Conference were sent to Prof. William Bacher, Dean of the Budapest Rabbinical Seminary, on the occasion of his sixtieth anniversary.

The centenary of Leopold Stein, Leopold Loew and Ludwig Philippson to be fittingly observed at the next Conference. Papers will be read on the life and labors of these reformers.

Dr. A. J. Messing, Sr., received the congratulations of the Conference upon the celebration of his seventieth anniversary.

Mr. Claude G. Montefiore delivered a notable address before the Conference. A rising vote of thanks was tendered him and he was unanimously elected an honorary member of the Conference.

A day was devoted to the discussion of religious school problems. A correspondence school for religious school teachers and correspondence courses for pupils who can not attend religious school were approved.

A religious school exhibit was begun for the use of the Conference and for loan to different State associations and individual schools.

A certificate of conversion for rabbi, convert and records of the Conference was adopted.

In memory of Abraham Geiger an entire day was devoted to the consideration of the life and work of this great reformer. Suitable papers were read. It was decided that the forthcoming Year Book be dedicated to his memory.

Efforts will continue to be made to bring students of universities under Jewish influence.

Congregations are requested to invite strangers to services and to send invitations to Jewish guests at the hotels.

It was resolved that, if feasible, Jewish singers be employed in choirs; that synagogue weddings be encouraged; that congregations be urged to publish year books or leaflets, setting forth their activities, and that Congregational Seder be used only as a means to foster the home celebration of the Seder.

The attitude of the District Grand Lodge, No. 2, I. O. B. B., in appointing official visitors to penal institutions was endorsed and recommended to other Grand Lodges for emulation.

The co-operation of the National Conference of Jewish Charities is sought in helping discharged offenders to secure self-supporting work.

All rabbis are urged to minister to the spiritual needs of Jewish prisoners.

All funds from the sale of Conference publications will go to the General Fund.

The Committee on Church and State reported the favorable attitude of

the leading men in the theatrical world towards the elimination of the objectionable "stage Jew."

Dignified accounts of the Jewish Holidays were sent to the various papers throughout the country.

An amendment to the Article VI, Section 3, of the Constitution was introduced. "No member of the Conference shall be elected as an Executive member of the Board for more than three terms, successively. This shall not be construed to apply to membership on the Board in virtue of service as President, Vice-President, Secretary, or Treasurer of the Conference."

Congregations are to be appealed to to include in their annual budgets, contributions to the Relief Fund and the Tract Fund and to causes of Jewish interest and education.

The members of the Conference are to endeavor to raise money for the publication of the translation of the Bible.

The members of the Conference are to devote a sermon to the necessity of congregants helping in the formation and conduct of services at summer resorts.

Young Israel was heartily endorsed and the U. A. H. C. praised for the interest taken and the efforts made to make this magazine a religious school journal.

A Religious School Text-book Commission was created to work out plans for the preparation and publication of text-books.

The denunciation of Russia's treatment of the Jews, by the General Assembly of United Presbyterian Church of America, was noted with appreciation.

The United States Government to be memorialized to continue its good offices in behalf of ameliorating present conditions in Russia.

Sabbath Zachor to be devoted to special prayers and sermon on the condition of Jews in foreign countries.

Rabbis are urged to request their congregants who are going abroad to present their passports to the Russian consul to be vised and when refused, to lodge complaint with the Department of State and invoke the aid of their congressmen and State senators.

The small Sabbath Service Book will be temporarily discontinued.

New editions of the Haggadoth, the Hymnal and Parts I and II, Union Prayer Book, were authorized.

Hereafter, no paper will be read before the Conference if the writer of the paper be absent.

A standing committee on "Synagogue and Labor" is to be appointed.

The Constitutional amendment offered to Article III, Section 1, was passed.

RESOLUTIONS SENT TO MR. CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE.

The session of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, held at Charlevoix, Michigan, U. S. A., in the year Nineteen Hundred and Ten, will be ever memorable in the annals of the organization because of the presence of our famed co-religionist, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, of London, England.

In order to express their profound appreciation of Mr. Montefiore's coming and their joy in the opportunity of close contact with his lovable personality, the members of the Conference present at this meeting do herewith honor themselves by electing their distinguished guest to *honorary membership* in their body, by unanimous vote.

The Conference regards the visit of the distinguished scholar and Jewish communal leader as in itself an inspiring instance of that unity of the household of Israel which, transcending distinctions of country and party, has always been the potent force for the maintenance of Judaism, by making it feel the quickening influence of its noblest representatives all over the world. And the Conference specially rejoices in its conviction that the foremost representative in England of the cause of liberalism and progress in Judaism has, by his acts and words, given a new impetus to the realization of the ideals of Reform in all lands, whereby the everlasting truths of Israel's religion will be made to harmonize with modern thought and modern ethical and spiritual needs.

We eagerly grasp this opportunity to speak what is in the hearts of the members of the Conference and what will remain with them as a precious memory. We will never forget the impress of the man who, by his large learning, deep culture, religious fervor, zealous loyalty to Israel's faith, and freedom of spirit in its interpretation, and, above all, by the charm and cordiality of the gentleman, made the message prevail by the force of his character.

The Conference herewith acknowledges to Mr. Montefiore the help of his inspiring words, voicing at its noblest the aspirations and obligations of progressive Israel. It regards his visit to America as a happy indication of the possibilities of the co-operation of the liberal forces on both sides of the Atlantic. It is further convinced that the bringing of a message by the leader of Jewish liberalism in England to the official Reform Jewish body in America is favorably significant for the cause of advanced Judaism in both countries. May this cause prevail in these and in all lands, and may our esteemed and beloved brother long be spared to hold aloft its standard and to witness its triumph.

Officers and Executive Committee of the Conference: Dr. K. Kohler, Honorary President; Max. Heller, President; Samuel Schulman, Vice-President; Moses J. Gries, Treasurer; Julian Morgenstern, Recording Secretary; Ephraim Frisch, Corresponding Secretary; Israel Aaron, Wm. S. Friedman, Maurice Harris, David Philipson, Isaac L. Rypins, William Fineschriber, Leo N. Franklin, David Lefkowitz, David Marx, Jos. Stolz, Louis Witt.

Charlevoix, Michigan, July, 1910.

A

MESSAGE OF RABBI MAX. HELLER, PRESIDENT OF
THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
RABBIS, TO THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CON-
VENTION, AT CHARLEVOIX, MICH., JUNE 28, 1910.

Colleagues and Friends:

It is time that this Conference cease to explain the reasons for its existence, or to set forth the proofs of its usefulness. With the present meeting it reaches its majority. Again and again, in their annual messages, have the successive presidents of this body argued the necessity of such an organization, enumerated the list of activities pursued, of public services rendered by the Conference. It is time that the gathered manhood of this rabbinical union set to other Jewish bodies the needed example of dropping apologetics. Let those defend their conduct who refuse to co-operate with us. We stand for united effort, for free deliberation, for sympathy with Jewish progress everywhere, for an optional uniformity wherever our growth seems to warrant it. Such aims require no apology. Let him who turns his back upon them explain to the world wherefore he chooses to prolong the anarchy of individualism and to separate himself from the congregation of his brethren. The mere fact that our example has been followed by our orthodox colleagues in this country, and by the rabbinate of other countries is practical evidence that the machinery of organization is to-day indispensable to all work of a public character. As the range of freedom broadens, as opportunities for service multiply, as competition becomes keener, the call for the concerting of efforts becomes more urgent. In the place of the rigid discipline of mechanical authority the liberal must put the strength of open discussion and systematic co-operation.

Nor need we apologize, at this late day, for the existence of Reform Judaism. Let those who interpret history through the inverted fieldglass of personal pettiness decry Reform as the gospel of convenience, as a secession of rebels, an imitation of the Gentile, a destructive "deform" of ancient heirlooms. The sober student of history discerns its inevitableness at just this period and the strides it is making in the face of impotent abuse. Liberalism, in one form or another, must always follow in the wake of a ripened civilization. Unquestioning faith in an immovable authority is part of that system of despotism—political, industrial, social and domestic—which lays the foundations of incipient culture. Along with all other emancipations that are incident to the healthy growth of society must come that deliverance from mythologies and creeds, from hierarchies and verbal inspirations which spells freedom of conscience and liberty of reasoning. It is equally onesided to claim that Reform was born of popular consciousness as to say that it sprang panoplied from great minds, to ascribe it solely to social or political causes, or to seek its origin in the unfoldment of Jewish science. It was a product of the historic atmosphere, the legitimate outgrowth prepared by the silent fermentations of centuries. It was part and parcel of the vast current of liberation which had to come with the widened outlooks, the new powers, the leveling movements of our age.

Just because, however, we have this abiding conviction that the Reform movement is a legitimate growth on the parent stem, that it is bound to extend to ever larger numbers as modern civilization, at its best, expands its realm, we can afford to speak without acrimony of those who do not march abreast with us. The time should have passed, on our side at least, for that bitterness of partisanship which vilifies persons and attacks motives. We ought to be able to honor and revere sincerity in those who differ with us, to love the outlived truth and the old-fashioned symbol at least in their old frames, to be patient with the half-grown, to be tolerant even of intolerance. Wherever the fault may lie, it is to be regretted, in the interest of American Judaism, that our last convention should have given rise to such

a recrudescence of partisan animosities, that indiscretions and misunderstandings should have led to protests and denunciations. Out of such controversies the truth does not become clearer, nor does religious enthusiasm of the right kind wax stronger through any such clashes.

Throughout its history, the Conference has preserved a friendly attitude towards our orthodox brothers. Repeatedly it has been stated in well-weighed utterances that our aims and our inspirations are the same; that we share alike the reverences of the past and the visions of the future. At our last convention we paid signal honors to a departed colleague whose fiery earnestness and whose Jewish zeal we recognized with gratitude, even while aware that he would have refused to affiliate with our Conference. In our subventions, as in our messages of congratulation or condolence, we have never drawn any factional lines. We have gone so far, in our recognition of the rights of tolerance, as to pass unanimous resolutions calling upon our asylums of benevolence to observe the dietary laws for the sake of those inmates who cling to the traditions of their faith.

The cause of loyalty loses nothing by the exercise of enlightened toleration. In the past few years we have been called upon to observe the centenaries of some of the great men whose names are identified with the rise of Reform Judaism. We accorded honor to Samson Raphael Hirsch by the side of Samuel Holdheim and David Einhorn. A little over a month ago Reform pulpits all over the country paid their tribute to the man who will always figure in the history of the movement as its protagonist, the man whose services to Reform Judaism as historian, theologian and critic, as journalist and organizer, as preacher and advocate, are larger in the aggregate than those of any other leader. The time must come when, like other great names of our past around which controversy raged in their lifetime, Abraham Geiger's will become the property of all Judaism. Meantime it is the special privilege of the Reform rabbinate to cherish it as an integral element of its history.

Our Conference planned as early as 1905 (Yearbook XV, page 161) to commemorate the Geiger centennial by the pub-

lication of a memorial volume. It resolved, two years subsequently (Yearbook XVII, page 117), that this volume was to appear not later than April 1910, the manuscript to be furnished not later than December 1909. It reported progress and detailed plans at the ensuing convention (Yearbook XVIII, page 56), and a still more detailed plan (Yearbook XIX, page 147) at the convention of last November. Since then the committee became embarrassed by the resignation of some of those who had promised important contributions, and the chairman has asked to be relieved of his duties. I would recommend that the enterprise be abandoned. Much of the ground proposed to be gone over is dealt with by specialists in Ludwig Geiger's volume, which has recently come from the press (Abraham Geiger, *Leben und Lebenswerk*, Georg Reimer, Berlin). In my opinion, the Conference is not justified, under the circumstances, in incurring the large outlay which would be involved in carrying through our long-planned enterprise. It is, indeed, to be regretted that our reading public should not have been given the opportunity of acquaintance with the life and works of this eminent teacher in Israel.

A commendable courtesy which may, in due time, lead to far-reaching consequences was inaugurated by our last convention, when it instructed its Executive Committee to convey expressions of good will to various organizations and men who are seeking to acclimatize the Reform movement in different parts of the world. We have towards these pioneers, in London and Paris, in Melbourne and St. Petersburg, the duty of elder brothers. At the same time, we have ourselves much to learn from the efforts of men who are testing our principles and ideals under new environments. Our messages and offers of publications were received, in each instance, with sincere appreciation. The coming years may bring forth striking developments wherever the heaven of Reform is at work.

Acting upon this cue, your Executive Committee has ventured upon an apparently novel step in extending an invitation to Claude G. Montefiore, Esq., to address this convention on "Liberal Judaism in England." An international invitation of this kind is not

without its precedent as between the two largest branches of English-speaking Jews. The present invitation was intended as a tribute to personality, as well as to scholarship and to pioneer liberalism. Mr. Montefiore has introduced himself to his American coreligionists long ago by his "Bible for Home Reading." The fame of his learned volumes and his good works has preceded him. Without committing ourselves to all of his opinions, we extend to him the cordial welcome of this convention of which he becomes by his mere presence an honorary member. May the contacts and co-operations between Anglo-Judaism and American Jewry increase and multiply upon every field of Jewish endeavor. We have much to learn from one another through the fortunate diversity of our habits and surroundings.

One of the principal benefits to be derived from such mutual spurring on consists in the heightening of that enthusiasm without which religious work suffers from a lack of vitality. The sense of mission is essential to all genuine religious progress, as eagerness to persuade must go with all strong conviction. Zionists, in the acrimony of debate, have spoken mockingly of our claims to a mission. The unfortunate contrast between declamation and indifference tempts at times irresistibly to satire and irony. That the mission of the Jew is, from the first and to the last, religious, admits of no contradiction in the light of history, and stands in no antagonism to political efforts which are aimed at cultural ends. Whether Judaism can take root and flourish in western soil, or whether it can attain vitality and growth only in its older home, safeguarded and at rest from wandering, this much is certain: that we must work together, that we must cope with the problems of the present, contend against religious indifference, foster religious education, maintain the spirit of sacrifice. Under this sense of duty the Conference has, in the past, partly discussed, partly undertaken, various lines of endeavor which are unmistakably missionary in their character. Our subventions, our free distributions of prayerbooks, tracts and other Jewish literature, our lecture-bureau, our annual holiday sermons—all these prove our eagerness for Jewish propaganda, our desire to embark upon an aggressive policy of wide religious education.

•

In the last few years we have begun to consider the problem of reaching those classes who seem to be more or less out of touch with Judaism, such as farmer and workingman, the criminal and the defective. Gradually we have learned that some of these activities call for large expenditure, and that our own resources as a chartered body are entirely inadequate to their pursuit.

We have come to a parting of the ways. We can not forever discuss and recommend what is to be done religiously for classes which are not now being reached. We need funds adequate to the pursuit of various lines of necessary work. If the new Bible translation is to be published at a popular price, if our tracts are to be spread broadcast, if our funds are not, in time, to prove utterly unequal to the task of pensioning the superannuated colleague, we must obtain large means; else our efforts along missionary lines will be rendered futile, and our discussions of religious needs remain purely academic.

Some of these problems have had serious consideration from your Committee on Solicitation, who will lay a plan of action before you. I trust that some temporary expedient will be devised to supply present exigencies. In the end, however, a large view of the whole problem may dispose us to a feeling that a radical change of policy may be needed in some quarters if American Judaism is to grow to the measure of its opportunities. I shall have to trench upon delicate ground in attempting to set forth my convictions in this matter.

It is my deliberate and well-weighed opinion that there is needed a change in the financial policy of our congregations, so far as expenditure for other than local purposes is concerned. If a comparison were to be instituted between other denominations and our own with respect to the proportions which obtain in congregational budgets between collections and appropriations intended to enhance the religious activities that benefit the individual congregation, and between contributions to religious work beyond its immediate pale, I fear the comparison would not rebound to the glorification of the unselfishness or public spirit of our congregations. Our congregational revenues, even in our richest organizations, are largely consumed in securing for the con-

gregation itself the ablest rabbi and the most artistic choir its means can command. By the side of these needs the religious school must be content with the most modest provisions. Some of our congregations maintain what might be called mission schools. Those belonging to the Congregational Union pay their contributions in varying proportions; some take up an annual collection in behalf of the Alliance Israelite Universelle. In the last two years congregations here and there have begun to realize their duty towards Jewish causes beyond their own pale. Our Tract Fund and *Young Israel* have had aid from several congregations. In the last few weeks two Eastern congregations have made large contributions to the contemplated Bible Fund.

There are many worthy objects of Jewish propaganda which can not obtain adequate support by appeals to the individual, in behalf of which the congregation must be trained to make sacrifices. In all organized denominations the struggling church, the church that has met with some disaster or other, can look to the organization for effective assistance. Our congregations are but loosely joined by the Union, to which they furnish the scantiest of resources. They do not contribute adequately to the maintenance of seminaries; they have given no aid to the Conference in its work of pensioning superannuated rabbis; they make no provision for any of the numerous needs of Jewish teaching; which have come to be recognized as urgent. The Isaac M. Wise Memorial Endowment Fund is still uncompleted, more than a decade after the demise of the great organizer of American Judaism. The Hebrew Union College is now appealing to the country for a building fund which is to enable it to erect a dignified and permanent edifice. The New York Theological Seminary likewise finds its endowment inadequate to its requirements. We need the strong and regular support of our congregations for the effective pursuit of a number of activities, the need for which must appeal to every loyal Jew. We can not publish and distribute tracts upon a scale commensurate with such an enterprise without the assistance of a special fund. The time is rapidly approaching when the resources of the Conference will be unequal to the providing of pensions for superannuated colleagues. We do not as

yet dare to think of ministers' widows and orphans for whom almost every other denomination deems it its duty to make special provision.

An appeal goes forth to the country for the paltry sum of \$50,000 to assist in spreading the new Jewish Bible translation. These duties belong to the congregation, rather than to the individual. We shall never be able to render effective and systematic service to the religious needs of the university student, the farmer and the workingman, of the summer-resort visitor; we shall never be able to attack the gigantic problem of providing religious instruction for the unchurched, until congregations will have been taught to feel their responsibility to the cause of Jewish teaching, their duty to their poorer or less privileged brothers, not only in the charitable, but in the religious and educational, sense.

While in our system of congregational polity the rabbi does not arrange the congregational budget, it comes within his province to educate his congregation towards broader methods and more unselfish practices. He ought to arouse the conscience of his congregation to its wider duties; he ought, at every opportunity, to champion a generous recognition of these duties. Since Judaism has a mission, it demands the zeal of self-sacrifice.

In this connection I desire to impress again upon our members their duty towards an important undertaking which had the sanction of their support from the beginning, and which is at present appealing for aid from the congregations—*Young Israel*. It would mean lasting discredit to our system of religious education if we proved unable or unwilling to support one solitary journal to serve our religious schools and our juvenile reading public, despite every effort and sacrifice that have been put forth by able and earnest men to make it all that such a journal ought to be.

During the nearly eight months of my administration the work of committees has been retarded by a combination of untoward circumstances, such as the brevity of the term and its falling completely within the working season, my absence from the New York convention, the tardy appearance of the Year Book. Much progress has, nevertheless, been made, as will be evidenced from a number of committee reports. In some committees no prog-

ress could be made owing to circumstances over which chairmen had no control. In other committees the work of several years has been brought perceptibly nearer to consummation. The Committee on Lyceum Bureau reports results which are gratifying, especially in view of existing obstacles and which offer good promise of steady expansion for the future. The Committee on Sermonic Literature bids fair, by joining hands with the Synagogue Extension Work of the Congregational Union, to solve the knotty problem of proper distribution. The Committee on Harmonization of Mosaic and Modern Marriage Laws is laying the foundation to valuable work. The Committee on Synagogal Music promises to continue its difficult task along the lines of Jewish tradition and religious effectiveness. The Committee on Tracts is preparing to publish, some time in the fall, a third tract on a subject of present import. Other committees whose reports are not yet on hand at the moment of writing will have valuable information and useful plans to present. Our Committee on Religious Education has been considerably enlarged and will present for your instruction a most interesting program.

In this connection I should like this Conference to consider with care whether the time may not have come when our body can, and should, apply itself to the task of creating a series of text-books for the religious school, beginning, most naturally, with a Bible history. Rabbi Kornfeld, in his thoughtful and suggestive review of Biblical histories at our last convention, has reminded us that, as far back as a decade ago, it was proposed at one of our conventions to appoint a committee for this purpose. That the text-books now in existence have failed in satisfying any large proportion of those in charge of religious instruction can scarcely be denied. Sooner or later other organizations, such as the Jewish Chautauqua or the Publication Society, will take up this work, if we profess ourselves unable or unwilling to undertake it. We have in this Conference the men whose ability and experience are equal to such a task. Under the criticism and with the co-operation of our membership, it could be pushed to a successful conclusion. There would be as little compulsion to adopt such a book as has been exercised in the matter of the Union Prayerbook, yet an

increasing, freely-embraced uniformity in our religious schoolbooks would mean benefits, needing no enumeration, which would almost exceed those that have come in the train of uniform worship.

During the last few months the Russian Government has added another unsavory page to its record of barbarous persecution by the systematic expulsions at Kieff and other places, which have filled our daily press with contradictory reports of inhuman cruelty and occasional relenting. Hardened though the world is becoming to the outbursts of Russian despotism, the present instance has drawn the spontaneous denunciation of religious and humane societies, such as the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of America, some of whom have forwarded protests to our Federal authorities and to the Russian Government. In the House of Representatives a resolution was moved expressive of righteous indignation, calling upon the President to use his friendly offices with the Russian Government for the prevention of such an outrage in the future. Your president was invited to join a representative body of Jews in pressing these resolutions upon the friendly attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the President with both of whom meetings had been arranged. Being unable to leave my work at the time, I appointed our colleague, Rabbi Abram Simon, whose presence and argument lent considerable force to the cause which is believed to have every prospect of a favorable issue.

Our Conference mourns the loss of two of our members since our last gathering—of Prof. Sigmund Mannheimer and of Rabbi Benjamin Bonnheim. The former, to whom an affectionate tribute is to be paid in the course of this evening's exercises, stood to a large number of our members in the relationship of teacher and fatherly friend. To all others his sturdy and loyal personality, the cordial and wholesouled interest he took in our work, meant no small contribution to the pleasure and profit of our gatherings. Rabbi Bonnheim was seen at more than one of our conventions, evincing his interest in our proceedings. His was the modest, earnest manner that bespeaks the aspiring worker.

At the end of my brief term of office, I find myself under numerous obligations to members of the Conference, to the chairmen of

committees, most of all to our officers, to whom I am beholden for many courtesies, for willing co-operation at all times. I have had the benefit, in important matters, of the valuable advice of our vice-president. The work of our secretaries has been both arduous and responsible. Our treasurer has administered his office with system and dispatch.

We are favored in this bracing climate by every condition promotive of sound work and genial intercourse. May the blessing of the Almighty be with us to establish the work of our hands, that our union may grow from strength to strength.

B

MEMORIAL ADDRESS—PROF. SIGMUND MANNHEIMER.

BY RABBI LOUIS D. GROSS, AKRON, OHIO.

"All my days I have grown up among the wise, and I have found naught of better service than silence; not learning, but doing is the chief thing; and whose is profuse of words causes sin." (Pirke Aboth I, 17)

Brethren: In accord with the dictum of Simeon, let me briefly but lovingly speak the sentiment of our hearts in this moment of sad yet joyous recollection. The silent hidden forces of existence are the most potent. Not in the storm or in the thunder, but in the still, small voice; not in the man who shouts is the divine, but in the silent wisdom of the calm thinker who communes with the good and the true. The vast, imposing mountain-peak, in all its silent beauty is more truly spiritual than the noisy, crowded, surging city; the babbling little brook is a truer sign of God than the deafening roar of the steam engine. So among men, it is the "inner quiet," the unseen forces that after all dominate their lives. That part of human character which is outwardly manifest is much less effective than that of which we only get glimpses, and which, for the most part refuses to be known. He who possesses in great degree this quiet God-like force may be found in sequestered by-ways; though far removed from the stress of broader spheres, faithfully does he fulfill his allotted task, performing the service of humanity; he cares not for loud acclaim in the public highway; he needs no granite blocks or fame, for the seeds he sows grow abundantly in the lap of eternity and sprout ever afresh in the minds and hearts of those who knew and loved him.

Such is the character of the man whose memory we hold in pious affection to-night; to him, though his life and deeds be not world-embracing, surely here in the circle of his disciples, is due the

feeble tribute of our homage and devotion. Upon his fresh grave tenderly we lay a wreath of loving remembrance. Sigmund Mannheimer has joined that immortal host who preceded him.

The last decade has witnessed the passing of three noble sons in Israel: Wise, founder and builder; Mielziener, saint-like character and scholar; and within the past year, Dr. Mannheimer, loving friend and faithful teacher, has been laid to rest. The Jacob of these Patriarchal figures, who by their work and presence honored the Hebrew Union College, was, by a sudden summons, called to the Academy on High, December 18th, 1909. ואמרו רבותינו יעקב אבינו לא מת We feel the presence of his geniality to-night, the sweet quaintness of his character, his joyous enthusiasm and deep sincerity; surely that earnest, gentle spirit abides now in the counsels of this Conference, of which, from its inception, he was a life-long, ardent member.

Sigmund Mannheimer was born in Kemel, a village in the Duchy of Nassau, May 16, 1835. His early life was attended by sharp struggles and tense labors. Though born in the midst of those broadening tendencies that followed close in the wake of the French Revolution, he was a victim of the illiberal and Medieval conditions which characterized all the smaller states of Germany, where the Jews as "Schutzjuden" still held the tenure of life at the call and beck of their sovereign. Mannheimer was possessed by a desire to rise out of these narrow environments. He received his early education at the Norman school, established by Dr. Benjamin Hochstaedter for the direct purpose of improving Jewish conditions in the small German villiages. In pursuance of this work and in the advancement of his people, Mannheimer performed noble service as a teacher. Always eager to learn and master the rich treasury of Rabbinical lore, he pursued his studies, for the most part alone and unaided, drawing on the sources of his native energy. Coming to America he served, ably and forcibly, various congregations throughout the country as preceptor. But it was above all in the institution at Cincinnati where Dr. Mannheimer accomplished his best and most enduring work. Here he found the atmosphere congenially suited to his taste and capabilities. With heart and soul he entered into his task as instructor in those elementary branches

which are so requisite and fundamental to a comprehensive grasp of our sacred literature. Often a thankless and laborious task is this pioneer work of instruction, but for more than a quarter of a century Dr. Mannheimer, lovingly and devotedly, gave himself to his appointed office. It was the joy and the passion of his life to teach. To each day's recitation he brought a wealth of youthful enthusiasm, and a blithe, winning personality which illumined both the text-book and the class-room, and remained with him up to the moment of his death.

Although he was a product of the old German school of strict disciplinarians, and was naturally characterized in his pedagogical methods by some degree of austerity, he was by no means the martinet, the obdurate, autocratic schoolmaster. With fraternal feeling and fatherly interest, he entered into the minds and hearts of his pupils and tried to understand their aims and hopes, their problems and difficulties. Never was he moved by petty whims and arbitrary fancies. In strict fairness he discharged his duties, and beautifully fulfilled the injunction of Rabbi El'azar: **יהי כבוד תלמידך קרוב עליך כשלך**. Throughout the period of his long, faithful service, his constant aim was to make the path of learning simple and pleasant; his most anxious effort was to enable his disciples to escape the difficulties and solve the perplexities which he had experienced as a student in his youth.

Above all he was distinguished by his conscientiousness, and by faithful application to his task. He was tremendously earnest in his work; he was absolutely sincere in every fibre of his being. With soldier-like precision and clock-like regularity he presented himself in the class-room day after day, year in and year out. To his honor be it said that during the last twenty-six years of his life, which he devoted to the Hebrew Union College, he missed not a single recitation. He took his task seriously. His exemplary integrity in preparing himself each day for the class-room should serve as a stimulus to all who apply themselves to the noble work of teaching; for too frequently in this day of diversified activity does the obligation rest laxly upon the shoulders of those who have in keeping the nurture of the mind and heart. The deeply conscientious spirit of our departed colleague led him to be severely and

rigorously precise in details, yet he was in no respect merely a plodding pedant, for he understood the prime necessity of exact knowledge in the labyrinthal path of elementary study. It is this thoroughgoing adherence to accuracy in details that stamped the man as a true student of scientific bent, and as a member of Israel's fraternity of scholarship. The quality of sincerity which preeminently characterized his life is revealed in all he wrote, notably his contributions to the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums," and his articles in the "Jewish Encyclopedia." His Hebrew Grammar was eagerly used as a text-book by students and became deservedly popular.

Not only in his appointed field of work, but in general cultural attainments, Dr. Mannheimer was, by dint of hard self-training a student and admirer of French and German literature. A lover of poetry, he was himself a writer of German and Hebrew verse of considerable merit. When in 1909, after twenty-five years of steadfast, unflinching service, his career was crowned with the highest honor in the gift of the Hebrew Union College, he became the recipient of a well-earned, fully merited acknowledgment.

But it is not only as teacher and scholar that we here fondly remember Dr. Mannheimer. Though it was not given him, either from an innate sense of genuine modesty or intense application to his task, to bid for plaudits at the shrine of fame, his work and worth are no less recognized, as we now record the life he lived. Most of you who are here assembled at this annual feast of faith were his disciples, loving and beloved. Need I recall to you the cordial spirit, the big heart and warm, earnest soul of our master who has left us? Have you not often sat at his feet conning the day's lesson, impressed by the kind severity of his discipline, reassured by the genial sparkle of his eye, refreshed by his vigorous yet gentle and forbearing manner? Has he not often as the presiding genius of the class-room lightened a dull moment by his keen shafts of wit, by the fund of delicate humor with which he was so richly gifted? Has he not often smoothed away our difficulties and hushed many a discordant note? Surely we needed just such warmth and gentleness in the struggling days of student life. As it is the flower that blooms in the winter, when flowers

are scarce, that we especially cherish, so it is the kind word that is spoken in the cold, barren period of our lives, when kind words are scarce, that we find most precious. Therefore, gratefully our hearts go out to him now as we recall his lovable personality, and realize that his loyal spirit and fine enthusiasm is our legacy. He was whole-heartedly Jewish, and sincerely religious. In the institution where he served so long and well, and where reverence should be the keystone of the curriculum, he was an inspirational force, by his personal example intensifying loving faith and emphasizing fidelity to the high principles of our cause. As a wise father and devoted husband his life was ideal, a concrete expression of his virile Jewishness. With Rabbi Nehorai he might justly have said at the close of his days: מניה אני כל אומנות שבעולם ואיני מלמד את בני אלא תורה. His wife, a woman of fine qualities and poetic attainments, was a true helpmate; his daughters devote themselves to the lofty work of teaching, and he lived to see that which was the crowning triumph of his life, when the two sons with whom he was blessed, were consecrated to the cause which this Conference holds dear. His children live to carry out the work and perpetuate the memory of their beloved father.

Sigmund Mannheimer the man was singularly modest and retiring. Active, alert, enthusiastic to the end, his was a calm, dispassionate, peace-loving temperament, that never harbored the smoldering feelings of resentment, that never took or gave offense. He was deeply appreciative and tenderly considerate, taking an unfeigned delight in the successes and accomplishments of his colleagues. He preferred the simplest enjoyments, sought the companionship of his students, and constantly assisted them in their tasks outside the class-room. He was indeed a disciple of Aaron; his life was a fulfillment of Hillel's teaching: אוהב שלום ורודף שלום אוהב את הבריות ומקרבן לתורה.

Sigmund Mannheimer the man, was singularly modest and re-whom the spirit of his fellow-creatures take delight, in him the spirit of the All-present takes delight." If he was beautiful in life, in death he was sublime. The moment of parting found him, like Dr. Wise of sacred memory, bravely, cheerfully standing at his post. Beside his life-long friend and colleague, Dr. Dentsch,

in the very presence of God in the house of worship, he calmly breathed his last, suddenly and without warning, quietly, like the peaceful slumber of an infant, without suffering or languishing, surely a rare privilege and a divine blessing: "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints."

We rejoice and are thankful for the long, happy, useful life that has returned to its home. If in life he was revered, in death he has been honored by the appointment of one of his own disciples to fill his chair. We realize that his years were fulfilled, that his place will be taken and his task resumed where he laid it down; and yet we can not help feeling a void, knowing that no longer may we have the uplift of his presence, the kindly sympathy of his words; but the lasting influence of his keen intellect and warm heart will remain with us as one of memory's finest treasures. Like a veritable patriarch of old he lived his life, a true son in Israel, a vigorous character, a sweet and gentle personality; an example of untiring activity, of beauty of character, of loyalty, and sincerity. Full well may we honor our friend and master and pay to him our humble meed of reverence, our feeble words of praise; **זכר צדיק לברכה** Full well may we keep his memory enshrined in our hearts, like a melody that is not forgotten, like an inspiring benediction.

C

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. CLAUDE G. MONTE-
FIORE, LONDON. ENGLAND.

I hardly know how rightly to address the gathering which I see before me. I have come to your land to learn and not to teach; to get and not to give. This is not selfishness, but represents the facts of the case, the actualities of the situation. And if I feel like that generally as regards myself and America, still more do I feel it as regards you. Bear with me, then, while I just put forward a few disconnected remarks relating to the subject and the cause which we all have so greatly at heart. Let me express to you my feelings as much as my opinions; and first of all let me deliver to you greetings and a message of hope, encouragement and thanks from a little band of fellow workers and sympathizers across the sea.

I ask you to let me express my feelings as well as my opinions. And the first and foremost feeling I want to express is one of gladness. I am glad to be among my own people. Does that sound at all odd? We use that word 'people' in so many different senses. May I not use it here in my own way to suit my own purpose and the feelings of the moment? A man speaks of his people when he means his family, and again he speaks of his people when he means his nation: I, of course, mean neither of these. My family and my nation are across the ocean in England. But a man also speaks of his people when he means his religious brotherhood, and my use of the word is akin to this,—a rather narrower use, if you will, but yet, I think, legitimate and pleasant. For I mean that, at last, I am among a chosen band of men, who, amid differences of detail, doubtless, think religiously as I think, are called by the same name—noun and adjective alike—and are united with me by the same hopes, aims and aspirations. And, so I can say, at least for a brief space—for a few moments in the hurried march

of time—(and how glad, I repeat, I am to say it), even as the Shumammite said of old, though with a difference of significance, בְּתוֹךְ עַמִּי אֲנִי יוֹשֵׁב “I dwell among my own people.” It is a goodly saying.

For the first time in my life I am in the company of a number of leaders of Jewish communities who to a large extent look at Jewish things as I look at them, and are knit together by common religious convictions. I am present at a Conference of Liberal and Reform Rabbis. I am among a band of teachers of Liberal Judaism. *You* have often met together before, and thus this gathering cannot stir among you the same feelings and emotions which it produces in *me*. But you will not, I hope, object to the new-comer, to the stranger in your gates—a stranger who is nevertheless at home—from giving expression to the thoughts and the feelings with which his heart and mind are full.

I will allude presently to our differences, but for the moment, and indeed for most of my address, I want to speak of our agreements, of that common bond which unites us together, of these common beliefs and hopes which justify us in giving to ourselves, within the larger group of which we form a part, a distinctive and peculiar appellation. In spite of differences, we have a common way of looking at religion and at Judaism, which separates us—for it is right to recognize separations as well as agreements—from that other older group of Jews who call themselves traditionalists or orthodox. This common way of looking at religion and at Judaism, these common beliefs and hopes, separate us also from that newest group of all, who, I have found, exist in America as they exist in Europe,—the Jews who call themselves “adherents of historical Judaism” or ‘middle party men’ or the ‘mediatizers.’ From all these we, who call ourselves Reformers or Liberals, though united to them by beliefs of the deepest moment, as well as by memories and ties of the gravest import, are yet separated and distinct. And when I realize who you are, leaders and teachers in Israel, a goodly band in number, and all united together by the bond of Liberalism or Reform, I can not help feeling glad at heart; I can not help feeling strengthened, stimulated, encouraged.

For I want to tell you something. Do we not all know how it

helps us when somebody thinks well of us, when somebody tells us that we have been of use to him (I mean 'use' in a moral or spiritual or religious sense)? We may think to ourselves: "Oh, if he but knew me as I really am. I am not worthy of his good opinion. How can I *really* have done him good?" We may think that,—and humility is always right and serviceable,—but nevertheless the knowledge that our friend *does* think well of us, that somehow we *have* helped him, stirs and stimulates us to become better than we as yet are, to grow more worthy of our friend's judgment, to deserve the help which we have given him more fully. Well, then, perhaps, it may stimulate you to even more higher issues when I tell you how in England isolated Liberals here and there, now united, many of them, in a special Union for the advancement of the Liberal cause, have looked hopefully, and still look hopefully, to you—to you across the seas, in this far land, already so great, yet assuredly destined to become still greater. We know that you, like all other human beings, that your creations, like all other products of man, are not perfect. We know that you have had, and still perhaps have, your vagaries, errors, excesses and defects. We know that you freely criticise each other, and we surmise that here in the New World, as well as with us in the Old World, the personal element is not always wholly excluded, but for all that, in spite of that, we still have looked, and we still look, to you. As your country is great already, but surely destined to become yet greater, so we trust and believe it will be with your Judaism. That too will become still greater,—that liberal, reform, progressive, spiritual Judaism which you are building up and developing, and to which we too would seek to render our humbler tribute of service and of faith.

The new birth, the new outlook, came to you from the Old World, from Germany. But Germany for a time fell back, though Germany is rapidly again coming to the fore. You remained true to the new light, the new hopes, the new beliefs: you sought to apply them in practice, to make a correspondence between faith and life. You adopted and adapted; you developed and went forward.

And now the ferment has begun again in the old countries: the tide of Liberalism has flowed back eastwards, and the Liberal

movement, to which you have remained true and staunch, and which you have cherished and held high, has become again alive, and is again making progress, in Germany, its original home, in England and in France.

Therefore we are grateful to you, and it is fitting, as it is pleasant, to record and to express our gratitude. We are grateful to you in spite of your mistakes and your crudities, which you yourselves make no effort to hide, and which sometimes you are perhaps inclined to emphasize too severely. I admit that I know very little about them, but ignorant as I am, I would feel nevertheless inclined to say: "Do not worry about mistakes and crudities too sorely: they are signs of life: they are youthful growing pains: they have usually been made from a right motive. We must not, you must not, take them too seriously. Even in correcting them, regard them hopefully as the emblems of youth, as the symbols of vigour." You have kept Liberal Judaism, in fact and idea, fresh and keen and strong, and you are keeping it so still. Trials and difficulties have come to you: you have them among you now: there are fresh problems, such as none forty years ago could have imagined or foreseen. But these trials and problems will not, I feel convinced, be too much for you. Let them be but as grist to your mill: let them be regarded as difficulties suited and fitted for your manhood and your faith to wrestle with and to overcome.

I have heard and I have read of you—"the rumour thereof" has reached 'my ears'—, but now I have come to see you face to face, and the sight fills me with fresh hope and renewed courage. In the words of the old formula, I feel inclined to thank God 'who has preserved me alive and permitted me to enjoy this season.' And turning to you I would say: 'Please, Sirs, do still better than you have yet done, and please, Sirs, above all things, stick together.' Bear with each other, bear with yourselves. It is sometimes so much harder to bear with oneself than with others, but, nevertheless, bear with yourselves. Hold the faith with high courage and devotion. Hold it and transmit to those who are to come after you, and who are to reap the fruit of your labours. Hold the faith with courage, but also hold it with wisdom, and hold it with knowledge.

It used sometimes to be said by hostile critics in England that Liberal Judaism meant unlearned Judaism, and especially did it mean that in America. The reproach is surely *now*, in every part of it, untrue. In Germany were not Geiger and Holdheim not merely great Liberals, but also men of vast learning, and today, when for the first time a book has to be written on the Systematic Theology of Judaism, have not the editors of the series, in which that book was to appear, to come to America, and to a distinguished *Liberal Jew* in America, for the best man to produce it? Liberal Judaism may be learned Judaism, just as much as any other phase and variety of our common faith.

Once more, then, you representatives of all shades and degrees of Liberal Judaism, you, who in spite of differences, look the same way, who share the same hopes, are cheered and strengthened and held together by the same aspirations and beliefs, I greet you and hail you from my heart to-day.

Now I have repeatedly spoken of common beliefs, common aims, common aspirations. Is it possible for me very roughly, very briefly, to define or describe these, and shall I carry you all with me in the attempt? I am not wholly certain, for it may be that one portion of the common bond, which, as I think, unites you and me and all of us together, may not be approved or agreed to by one or other of those here present. On the other hand, it is possible that a portion of the bond, which seems essential to this one or that, may by me be omitted, and perhaps have rightly to be added hereafter. It would be pleasant, indeed, if while there was something to add, there was nothing to subtract. In any case the attempt must be made, so that it may not be said of me that I am not able, or have not ventured, to define my meaning or to go beyond empty and vague generalities. What, then, as I conceive it, is the common bond, what are the common beliefs, aims and aspirations?

First among them, I would place a certain new attitude, involving a modified belief, toward the sacred Books, towards Bible and Talmud, towards Pentateuchal and Rabbinic law. No longer can we declare that we believe with perfect faith the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth articles of the Maimonidean creed. We occupy a

new position towards authority, for we do not recognize the absolute authority of any book or code. I need not go into these matters in detail. It is unnecessary here to explain that our freedom is not license, and that before the authority of the moral law, recognized in conscience, and by conscience, as having its ultimate source in God, we too bow down in reverent homage and in free self-surrender. All this and more before the present audience need not be enlarged upon or developed. All I would here say is to acknowledge, on the one hand, or to maintain, upon the other, that this new attitude towards, this new belief respecting, the Bible and the Talmud do constitute a marked difference in our Judaism from the Judaism of our forefathers or the Judaism of orthodox believers at the present day. He who honestly believes that the Pentateuch is the absolute, perfect, immutable word of God, that it was all written down by Moses, that all the laws in it, moral, civic, ceremonial alike, were dictated to Moses by God, that all the stories and miracles recorded in it from the twelfth chapter of Genesis onwards happened exactly as they are alleged to have happened,—such a one, though united to us by beliefs of still more far reaching importance,—is also separated from us by a gulf of magnitude of which it were foolish and unfair to deny. And yet such a one, I take it, is a true representative of orthodox Judaism, of Judaism as practically everybody believed it from the days of the Maccabees to the days of Mendelssohn.

But one more word I do want to say about the first portion of our common bond. It is this. Our new attitude, our new belief, about Bible and Talmud are not as our opponents would fain assert a purely negative attitude, a purely destructive belief. Far from that. It is a liberating and emancipating belief with immense, positive implications. It implies a new and grander conception of God and of His relation to man. It implies a new and grander view of God in history, and of the action of the divine spirit. It implies a new and grander conception of authority and freedom, and of the meaning of autonomous morality. Our new attitude—this portion of the common bond—is constructive and enlarging.

Then, secondly, and partly as a corollary from the first portion,

or again, from another point of view, as the source of it, I would put the free and glad and fearless acceptance of the ascertained results of history, criticism and science. God is truth and the source of truth. The truth can never harm either us or our Judaism. We welcome truth, we bow down before truth, even as we bow down before its origin and source. We are so convinced of the truth of the essential doctrines of Judaism, so sure of their independance of any results which criticism and historical inquiry may have to discover and tell us about books and ceremonies and dates, that we walk fearlessly and with head erect. We look criticism and historical enquiry boldly in the face; their conclusions will never shake or overturn the faith which is in us.

Then, next, I regard as third portion of the bond our determined desire, our resolute aim, to bring about a gradual harmony and reconciliation between faith and conduct, between inward and outward religion. We want to create for ourselves and for others a life of unity, a consistent life in which there shall be no jar and dissonance, no break and contrariety, between what we believe and what we do, between our private and our public acts of worship and of devotion. It is easy to see that in the carrying out of this aim there is opportunity for haste, for error, for follies. But none the less do we hold to our aim, and recognize its right. We offer the strongest possible opposition to that sort of Judaism—it emanated, I believe, from Breslau and is associated with the names of Z. Frankel and of H. Graetz—which says: ‘Believe what you please, but act in one way only. Believe what you please as to the *origin* of the Pentateuchal and the Rabbinical laws about food—rabbit and hare, meat and milk—but nevertheless observe them in their entirety.’ We, on the contrary, say, ‘Let your belief and your actions form a unity: let your doings be an expression of believings, your life of your faith.’ Surely this portion of the bond, like the former portions, constitutes something positive and inspiring. Our opponents may disagree with it or with the application of it, but they can hardly assert that it is negative or irreligious. For this aim of ours is emphatically a religious aim; we want one and the same religion to express itself vitally in all our actions, and to recognize itself both in our private and our public

life. The public worship and ceremonial of our synagogues, and the private worship and ceremonial of our homes, are to be the out-flow and the representation—justified and satisfying alike to our reason and our emotions—of one and the same faith.

Then, fourthly, as the next portion of the bond,—we may, in a certain sense, regard it as an aspect of the preceding, third portion—I would place our aspiration, or our desire, to bring about an effective reconciliation of the claims upon Judaism of the past, the present and the future. Such a reconciliation, such a wise apportionment of three insistent claims, is no easy task, and here again we see that hard is the good. But we do not despair, remembering, as we saw and said before, that difficulties are made to be overcome. Judaism is an historical religion, and a distinctively historical religion we desire that it shall remain. But Judaism, as we all, I think, believe, is also a universal religion, or, at any rate, to become a universal religion is its goal. For us who live in western lands there are special questions and problems involved in our desired reconciliation of past and present and future. How far can and should oriental customs be observed in a western environment? How far must history yield to the pressure of outward circumstance? Here looms up the gigantic question of the Sabbath. We may not all work out the reconciliation in the same ways and along the same lines. But that there is need of reconciliation, that present and future have their urgent claim as well as the past—in that we are all agreed. We are all agreed, I take it, that we must not so magnify the claims of the past, or the need for preserving the links with history, that we run the grave risk lest in the future there remain no religious Jews for whom those historic links will have been preserved. Here, again, there can be no question that our aim is a great one and well worthy of the best thinking of the finest men. And while it is essentially *our* aim, it is only *we*, I think, who are able, or have the means, to solve it or fulfill it. For it is only *we* who stand in free reverence before the past, and look in trustful reverence towards the future. We need not say: 'It is the Law. We can not teach it.' We need not say: 'God is not with us as He was with our fathers.' For we believe that His spirit

is with us still, and so, hard as our task is, high as our aim, we lack not confidence, we lack not hope.

Lastly, I place as the fifth portion of the bond, an aspiration or a belief which, in one sense, is common to all Jews, but which, I think, only we Liberals consider should have any influence upon our religious action or institutions. It is the aspiration or belief that Judaism is to become, at last, not merely the religion of one race, but of many races, not merely of one people, but of many peoples. And by Judaism I take it that we mean, not merely one or two abstract doctrines, such as the doctrine of the Unity of God, but our religion as a whole, including its doctrines and its worship, its inward faith and its outward form.

These, then, are our common beliefs, hopes, aspirations. . . . These things constitute our bond of union. These are the fundamentals of a specifically liberal Judaism. I think that these five teachings or ideals are common to us all. They unite us all from Dan to Beersheba, or should I rather say from San Francisco to New York, and from New York to London, Paris and Berlin? And do they not also bind together all of us whatever our shades of differences, our grades and our varieties? And pray observe what is now to follow. In the common beliefs and aspirations which I have thus described and defined, there was nothing of convenience and very little of environment. Environment, indeed, entered into the fourth portion of the common bond, but only into one part or aspect of that portion, and not at all, I think, into any of the other portions. The questions of environment have, from one point of view, been somewhat exaggerated. They are not primary, but secondary questions, though it happens that one particular problem of environment is, as I have already observed, of gigantic practical importance. Let me put what I mean in as emphatic a way as I can. Suppose that the Zionist ideal were fulfilled tomorrow, suppose that you and I and every other Jew in the world were living in Palestine as members of the Jewish State, I contend that we all could and should be liberal Jews, and that Liberal Judaism would still be our religion. I even contend (I will say a word as to this later on) that the five portions of the common bond would still remain untouched and unharmed, still

remain as the substance of our common beliefs and our common aspirations.

If Liberal Judaism were a mere matter of environment, still more, of course, if it were a mere matter of convenience (a charge which we all repel with some scorn and indignation), it would have failed already and long ago. But it has not failed: it is exceedingly alive.

How best to preserve Judaism in our western environment, where a minority of Jews live amid a vast majority of Christians is doubtless a matter of enormous importance and difficulty. Yet with all the big questions which it involves it is not really of the essence of Liberal Judaism. After all, the question of *preservation* is common to all forms of Judaism alike, though, as we believe, from our freer point of view, and because we can so much more easily open our eyes and see, we are in a far better position to find palliatives or solutions.

Two things strike me here. The origin or occasion of a matter or a cause must not be confused with its essence. Liberal Judaism may have *started* with questions of environment or even of outward decency, but nevertheless it is, in itself, and in its full development, more and other than they. That is, I think, important for us to bear in mind. And then, let us not be wrongly influenced by what our opponents say of us. There is a right influence and a wrong influence to be obtained from adverse criticism. A wrong influence is when we are so often told that we are this and that, that at last we come to believe that it is true. Perhaps we even seek to explain it, and justify it, whereas really all the time there is a fundamental inaccuracy.

Liberal Judaism is not merely a western Judaism which seeks to adapt itself to modern environment; still less is it a Judaism of expediency, and least of all is it a Judaism of convenience. *Essentially* it is only a Judaism of adaptation to modern environment if we include in the words 'modern environment' all the true discoveries of history, criticism and science, with all the true developments of ethical and religious thought, which have taken place during the last hundred and fifty years.

Liberal Judaism, as I contend, is the Judaism of today, but it is

not, in its essence, American Judaism, or English Judaism, or German Judaism. If we lived in Palestine or Mesopotamia it would be our Judaism still.

Liberal Judaism is, as we have seen, an attitude of mind, a vital combination of beliefs and aspirations. It is not a number of externalities. It is not English in the public service rather than Hebrew; it is not bare heads instead of hats, except in so far as these and other details imply and express our new attitude and convictions towards authority and tradition. All these matters are secondary.

Just in the same way, and for similar reasons, I would deny that Liberal or Reform Judaism has any essential connection with expediency, except in so far as, in addition to the freer attitude towards authority and tradition and the frank openeyedness which I have already mentioned, Liberal Jews are filled with an intense desire for all living Jewish souls to *be religious* and to *have religion*. I have heard the view expressed from orthodox lips that God will always preserve enough witnesses to His perfect Law. The indifference of these, the apathy of those, the apostacy of a third group, the total non-religiousness of a fourth, can be viewed with comparative unconcern. Let them go: God will always look after His own. There will always be enough men who are willing to live and die for the *Torah*. Sooner let a thousand souls be alienated from religion (and is it not their own fault?) rather than one conscious deviation from the mandate of the Pentateuchal and the Rabbinic Law. Well, for those who in honesty and full conviction are bound hand and foot to the Code books, there is nothing else to do, and perhaps a bad consolation is better than none. But Liberal Judaism and Liberal Jews have very different feelings. To *them* that a single Jewish soul should live and die without religion and the conscious acceptance, and the inspiring remembrance, of the Divine Call, is a calamity and an accusation. To *them* indifference and apathy and irreligion are worse, far worse, than organs, and English, and bare heads, and Sunday services.

If changes and adaptations of this kind be called concessions to convenience and expediency, so be it. We will not be frightened

from right doing, and from the desire to save and gather in, by the noise of criticism.

Yet with all these concessions, if some choose to call them so, with all these changes and adaptations, I dare to say, and I want to urge, that Liberal Judaism is not an easy Judaism, but a *hard* Judaism. It is not, easier than Traditional Judaism, but *harder*. It is harder to be nobly free than to be bound to the letter of a code. Every phase of Judaism is hard, but our Judaism is, from one high point of view, the hardest of all. In the highest and best sense it is a hard religion, for it makes great demands upon the mind and the will of those who accept it. It is hard to live *in* the world and to be not *of* the world. It is harder in some ways to be a true Jew, with the thought of God in your mind, outside the ghetto than within it. It is harder, in one sense, to live the religious life without a multiplicity of forms than with them. But Liberal Judaism dares to ask that men and women shall be equal to this hardness and even make it their opportunity. Liberal Judaism, like every religion worth its salt, asks for sacrifice; it dares to believe that it can find men and women who will realize that a living Judaism, a Judaism which does not conflict with reason or conscience or feeling, but which, on the contrary, supports and develops them, is worthy of the sacrifice which it demands. Liberal Judaism has its difficulties and its trials: it is not a *soft* religion. It asks for the whole man, the whole woman. It believes that the time has come when, in America and Europe at all events, what it asks for can be given. It believes that its demands are not beyond the developed manhood and womanhood of to-day and to-morrow. But it also *demands* much because it holds that it can *give* much. It can inspire men's lives with the passion for righteousness and the love of God. It feels within itself the power, right within the modern world and modern conditions, to produce its heroes and above all its saints. So it goes forward upon its great task with faith, with gladness and with hope.

And now I want to show that I did not, at the outset, use the expression 'disconnected remarks,' idly and to no purpose. I want to make a digression, or at all events to touch upon a matter unrelated to almost everything that I have yet said. You will re-

member the five portions of the common bond that unites the Liberal Jews of every wing and section, as I conceive, together. I now ask, Does what I then said imply that, to me, no Zionist, and shall I even add for completeness' sake, no Territorialist, can be a Liberal Jew? that no Liberal Jew can be a Zionist?

I answer, No. A certain kind of Zionist can hardly be an adherent of Liberal Judaism. A Liberal Jew can hardly be a certain kind of Zionist. But the cross cleavage which Zionism produced in Jewry is not an unreal one. We know that both in the Zionist and anti-Zionist ranks (at least this is so in Europe,) there are Liberals and Traditionalists. So far as I see things, the presence of both in either party is not unjustified and not inconsistent. I am here only concerned with the Liberal who is a Zionist, and in respect to him I want to say what follows:

A Liberal Jew may hold these two opinions. He may believe that for an indefinite period Anti-Semitism is extremely likely to occur in every country where there are enough Jews. In one form or another, he may believe, that Anti-Semitism will continue to exist all over the world for a very prolonged time. Therefore, he may hold that, for a very large portion of the Jewish race, the only hope or chance of fair and free, full and quiet and happy development is for them to live together in one land, and that land their own. He may deeply regret the conclusion to which he has come, but none the less he may declare to us that he holds it in all sincerity, and that to ignore facts when they are unpleasant serves no useful purpose, and is but the protection of the coward or the fool.

That, then, is his first opinion, and his second is this. For the religious life and for the preservation of Judaism it is imperative that Jews, like other men, should consecrate to rest and religion one regular day in seven. The Sabbath of Judaism is the seventh day of the week. The Sabbath of the whole western world is the first day in the week. Or to put it less dogmatically and more simply, the Sabbath of the Jews happens to be *one* day, the Sabbath of everybody else happens to be *another* day. Now in the Western world you must do as your neighbors do as regards work and rest. When they work, you, the tiny minority, must work, and

probably, too, and more and more, when they *rest*, you, the tiny minority, will *rest* likewise. You cannot, therefore, observe your own Sabbath; but also you *cannot transfer* it. You can *rest* on Sunday, but you can not make a holy day of Sunday. You can not consecrate it religiously unto God. Hence the Jew, on the horns of dilemma, must more and more become a religionless animal, and in this description of his future, the noun (as the sequence of the adjective) has a certain dread correctness and significance. Your Sabbath afternoon, your Friday evening, and your Sunday morning services, are, the supposed Liberal Jew may tell you, mere palliatives. They will not serve our turn. There is only one real remedy, however much we may regret it. The Jews must live altogether in their own land, when the Saturday Sabbath can again freely be theirs. Thus from the two opinions which our Liberal Jew holds, he draws one and the same conclusion: to each there is the same moral.

Nevertheless, though these are his opinions and his inferences, there is surely no reason why he should not also believe in Liberal Judaism. He may believe and desire that, when the Jews are living together in their own land, the religion which they will profess will more and more become Liberal Judaism. Why not? He may think that many Traditionalists would be more willing to make practical changes in Palestine than in the Diaspora. He may also honestly desire that the full Jewish religion (as apart from the mere Jewish nationality) may spread, in faith and rite, far beyond the confines of the Jewish race. He may argue: "Because I am in one sense a Nationalist, and believe in a future for the Jewish nation, I do not therefore believe, on the contrary I disbelieve, in a national religion. An historical religion, yes; a national religion, no."

Such is my defense for the Liberal Jew who is also a Zionist, though when you have to make a defense for another man, who represents a side which is not your own, you are very liable, I admit, to make mistakes. I may, therefore, have made some, but I ran the risk, because I am very anxious to keep all Liberal Jews together, whatever may be their opinions on other matters which may also affect the Jews. And just as I want to keep the Zionist

Liberal within the liberal ranks, so I want, and much more earnestly and keenly, to unite and keep together Liberal Jews all over the world, in spite of their national distinctions and varieties. I want them all to recognize and remember the deep underlying agreements. Let us learn from our differences to correct our own onesidednesses. There are varieties of Liberal Judaism in America, but all these varieties will probably differ a good deal, at least in outward manifestation and appearance, from Liberal Judaism in Germany or England or France. One side of Liberal Judaism may appeal most to one nation, and a second side of it to another nation. The reconciliation of past and present and future may be carried out differently in different lands. The different conditions of the Jews in the different countries of the Old and the New World may also affect the practical carrying out of principles which are common to us all. Even the principles—, even of the five portions of the common bond—, some may seem of greater force, and may be more fully worked out, in one country than in another. Yet Liberal Jews we all are, animated by a common hope, living by a common faith, working for a common end.

I, the English Liberal, have come to learn, so far as in a short and hurried visit a man can learn, from you. Have I anything to tell you of us?

At one time I had intended to fill my paper with an account of English Liberalism and English Reform. But I thought better of this partly because, as regards the past, it is a thrice told and familiar tale, while as regards the present—there is some promise, but, so far, not much performance.

The Reform Synagogue which was started in London in the year 1842 had a somewhat special origin, and has had a somewhat peculiar history. It illustrates my contention that Reform may begin through causes and occasions which are not, in themselves, *essentially* connected with itself. The Reform Synagogue was founded through the refusal of the existing congregations and their governing bodies to make any changes in certain outward forms, in certain externalities of worship. Order, decency and some regard for dignity and beauty were sought for; more frequent

pulpit instruction was required, and a service less inordinately long. The refusal of these moderate requests led to secession. But so far, nothing, I believe, had been said about doctrine. When, however, the new synagogue was founded, through various causes into which I cannot enter here, a very important, though not wholly satisfactory, change of doctrine soon emerged. The divinity and absolute authority of the oral or Rabbinical law were denied; the divinity and absolute authority of the Bible and the Pentateuch were strongly maintained. Thus in the blessing during Tabernacles reference is still made to the divine order to gather palm branches and to dwell in booths, but in the service for Chanukah the words "who has commanded us to kindle the light" are carefully expunged. So this English Reform became a return to the simpler rulings of the Pentateuch, but for that very reason,—because it clung to the letter of Scripture—it ran the same risk which the Karaites have run, the risk of gradual sterility and fossilization. In private life the members were taught to observe the distinction of foods—for these distinctions are Pentateuchal—but to neglect the laws about meat and milk for these rulings are merely Rabbinic. It must be remembered that the Synagogue was founded at a time when even the beginnings of Biblical criticism were unknown in England. Professor Marks, the senior minister of the Synagogue, who left his impress deep upon its members, devoutly believed in the Mosiac origin of the Pentateuch and in the divinity, perfection and immutability of all its laws. This statement would, at least, be wholly true of the first thirty years—the most important and fruitful years—of his long ministry. The noble and distinguished men who founded, and regularly worshipped in, the Synagogue were all, I think, devout believers, and faithful and punctilious observers of those Pentateuchal laws which they had been taught were still to be obeyed outside Palestine and after the fall of the Jewish State. My uncle, Sir Francis Goldsmid, who I might add was the very incarnation of an English gentleman of a fine type, perhaps less seen now than formerly, always walked home from the House of Commons in Westminster on Friday evenings to his own home in the Regent's Park—a distance of over two miles. My mother often told the story how once in

the old coaching days, she was driving down on Friday with her father Sir Isaac Goldsmid—Sir Francis Goldsmid's father—from London to Brighton. A delay arose at some halting place on the way, and it seemed likely that Brighton would not be reached until an hour after Sabbath. My mother used to say that she vividly remembered the desperate anxiety of her father, and how he kept offering the most enormous bribes to the driver and the postilions if by any possible means—I fear even the law against cruelty to animals was forgotten—they could reach their destination before the sun had sunk. I mention this anecdote, which is authentic and belongs to a world that has passed away, to show you the sort of men they were who founded the Reform Synagogue of London. Naturally enough the external reforms of such devout believers did not go far. There was an organ, but the sexes, except in the choir who were hidden behind a grating, were rigorously separated, the service was wholly in Hebrew, and the heads were covered. The second days of the holidays were, however, abolished, for these, it was said, had positively led to the infringement of a Biblical law: God told Moses that unleaven bread was to be eaten for seven days, whereas, in violation of that law, Rabbinical Jews eat it for eight.

As the Synagogue was started, so it continued. To this day the service has not essentially changed, and the character of the institution has not essentially been modified. Synagogues on the same lines have been established in Manchester and at Bradford. Thus the first attempt at Reform has not, so far, adopted a definitely Liberal position. It is neither quite orthodox nor quite reform, but it has taken up a line to which, so far as I know, neither Germany nor America offers parallels or analogies. Yet even as I write, partly owing to circumstances of which I have still to speak, a fresh movement has been started within the walls of the Synagogue to reform its services in the direction of reading half the Sabbath liturgy in the vernacular and of allowing men and women to sit together. It is, however, significant that the promoters of these changes, which, as it seems, will probably be carried, have been careful to point out in a written manifesto to the seatholders that they neither ask nor desire any change of *doctrine*.

The alterations they seek are limited to pure externalities. Whether the changed externalities will ever lead to a pronounced and authorized Liberal teaching, no man can tell.

I have now to say a few words about the Jewish Religious Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism, to give it its present complete title, but the second clause after the word 'Union' represents an addition to the original appellation which, as you will hear, indicates a new development, quite unthought of at the Union's foundation eight years ago. The Union was founded by a woman, Miss Lily Montagu, one of the foremost women, it would be more right to say the foremost woman, in Anglo-Jewry, and perhaps I might add a very notable and noble personality. The Union is a curious example of an institution which had not a distinctly Liberal or Reform origin, being driven by an inward, as well as an outward logic, to take up a distinctively liberal attitude.

Miss Montagu brought together, as the first members of a Committee or Governing Body of the Union, a number of persons by no means all of the same views. Though most of them were strong Liberals, all were not. They were united by two convictions: First, the conviction that from a religious point of view much was amiss in the condition of English, and especially of London, Jewry. Secondly, the conviction that the old statutory services of the Synagogues were powerless to remedy the evil. So far as doctrine went, the Committee put forward nothing except this: that there was room in Judaism for more than one representation of it, both on the side of teaching and on the side of outward form. Hence they determined, first, to have a free pulpit, from which suitable persons, whether clerical or lay, of divers opinions, should speak the truth, as they saw it, without hindrance or correction; and, secondly, to institute Sabbath afternoon services, which should be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, the statutory services of the existing synagogues. They would form no separate congregation, but merely hold services and perhaps some classes for children. Some of the Committee had keen hopes that these services might before long be, as it were, linked on to, and held in the building of, one of the existing synagogues. Two orthodox ministers were on the original Committee, and one of the ministers of the Reform

Synagogue. The Committee determined that at the afternoon services the sexes should sit together, (upon this change they laid much stress), and that the service should be almost entirely in English. It was thought that the language and the hour of the services would get over two commonly alleged reasons for non-attendance at the synagogues.

Now what happened? The orthodox party saw more clearly than we. They realized that the one doctrine which united us, the one doctrine which we *did* declare to be an official doctrine of our Union, the doctrine, namely, that there was room in Judaism for more than one representation of it, both upon the inward and the outward side,—that this one doctrine was unorthodox, liberal and false. For orthodoxy says that there is only one Judaism, or at least only one *right* Judaism, and that no other Judaism than this must be admitted, tolerated or encouraged. Our free pulpit was abhorrent, for our free pulpit often put forth very markedly liberal opinions. Thus the Union met with determined opposition; the two orthodox ministers, and the one Reform minister were forced to resign, and the Union was compelled to rely wholly upon its lay supporters and lay preachers. These lay preachers all happened to be Liberals, and so the teaching from the Union pulpit took more and more habitually a definitely liberal hue.

It cannot be said that the Sabbath afternoon services or the Union itself proved a great success. The membership was small and soon stationary; the attendances at the services were meagre. For this and other reasons some of us began to feel that a crisis was inevitable. There were frequent troubles and dissensions in our composite cabinet. The majority on the Committee came to the deliberate conclusion that we must either go forward or close the undertaking. Mere afternoon services without a minister, without the regular adjuncts and opportunities of congregational life, could lead to no permanent result. We had no stability. A definite point of view; a deliberate assumption and declaration of the Liberal hope, the Liberal doctrine, were also absolutely necessary. The large majority of the members was on our side. And so, to everybody's sorrow, for we were all close personal friends, the more conservative members of our Committee left us; their places

were filled by definite and eager Liberals; a homogeneous governing body was secured, and we set forth to found and establish a new Liberal Congregation with its own minister, its own building, and all the many activities of distinct congregational life. The Union was, as I have already said, renamed, the Jewish Religious Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism. Our colours are nailed to the mast. There is no mistaking them.

And that is all that I have here to tell you. For the new chapter has not yet got further forward. But all here, I am confident, trust and pray that this new chapter may have a prosperous unfolding. To us, as well as to you, many problems remain to be 'solved as we go.' For our aims are, from one point of view, problems. The reconciliation of faith and practice, doctrine and life; the due adjustment of the claims of past, present and future—these and other important and even urgent problems, demand all the tact and learning, all the insight and judgment, which we can bring to bear upon their solution. They are all the harder, and need the more delicate care, because of those other problems of environment amid, or in, which they have to be grappled with and overcome. Not only must we remember again and again that hard is the good, but we must also continually bear in mind that truth and goodness are not necessarily simple, but, on the contrary, are often complex and many-sided. And another thing we must remember too, and that is, in our zeal for harmony and reconciliation not to force the pace,—to recollect that a certain measure of compromise (which does not mean any tampering with truth) is necessary in all human and practical affairs.

Let us not be either over confident or despondent. No swagger, and yet no hesitation. Forbearing to each other; united over against the world.

I speak for myself, who know my own environment, and not for you when I say: let us, both to our own souls and to the Jewish and the non-Jewish outer world, never hesitate as to our own good right to our chosen adjective and still more to our chosen and cherished noun. We stand within the Jewish fold, and nothing that men can do will drive us out of it. Though we be misrepresented and misjudged, though we be mocked and ridiculed, though we be covered

with invective and abuse, liberal Jews we are, and liberal Jews we will remain.

And may I say yet one more word before I close? I have said that Liberal Judaism is no easy religion: it makes upon its adherents a big and a persistent claim. It is specially incumbent upon us to bear in constant mind, and to teach with anxious care, that religion is manifested and expressed not only in righteousness and social service,—though how essential these are I need not mention,—and not only in public worship and outward institutions—though the importance of these I for one shall never minimize,—but also, and most essentially of all, in the inner and spiritual life. No religious community is in a healthy condition which has not, and does not produce, its saints. Liberal Judaism must have them, and produce them, no less, I pray even more, than any other phase of our common religion. What is the definition of a saint? I will not venture to say, but of this I feel sure that though a saint is a very good and righteous person, a very good and righteous person is by no means necessarily a saint. And this, too, I think I know, that saintliness includes humility and reverence and a certain detachment of mind. The saint, I think,—though none may be aware of it—communes a good deal with God, and lives much in His realized presence. The saint, as his name implies, has successfully fulfilled the cardinal commandment of Judaism. He is holy. Few of us, very few, can be saints, but we can all set before ourselves, and set before those whom we have to influence and to teach, the high ideal of sainthood.

D

REFORM JUDAISM PRIOR TO ABRAHAM GEIGER, OR
THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RATIONALISM AND
TRADITIONALISM IN ANCIENT JUDAISM.

BY RABBI JACOB S. RAISIN, Las Vegas, New Mexico.

The fashion has recently been set, by those who desire to discredit Reform, to describe it as a parasitic growth or a foreign graft on the tree of Judaism, and to accuse the champions of the *Kultur-kampf*, which rages in Jewry for the last century or more, as actuated in their warfare by the wish to sell the Jewish birthright for a mess of Christian tolerance. Supposing, for a moment, this to be true, the countercharge can easily be made and proven that Orthodoxy itself is not free from exotic growths; that most of the precepts and practices which bear the imprimatur of conservatism, are in reality foreign adaptations, a sort of palimpsest behind which a different hand can readily be traced.¹ But apart from such aspersions which, in the Talmud-phrase, *Lomaalin vlo meridin*, which are prompted by the "aboriginal human neophobia," and remind us of the similar Catholic taunts with regard to the Christian Reformation—the fact is that the Jewish Reformation is neither of recent date nor due solely to external influences. A thousand subtle forces have been at work preparing Judaism for the revolution which was inaugurated at the beginning of the nineteenth century and is still incomplete. It is written in the Bible, repeated in the Talmud, reiterated in rabbinic literature and, as a limit to its horizon, we needs must look back to the origin of Orthodoxy itself. Modern Reform was adumbrated at the early dawn of Judaism; it is the

¹See *Br. R.* XLVIII. 9; *R. H. Ta.* (Tos. "Middibre"); *j. R. H.* i. 2. 4. *Sefer Hasidim*, No. 1106. *Chagiz Mishnath Hakhamim*, 205. *Bernfeld, Daath. Elohim*, I. 71-83, Warsaw 1897.

perfection and fruition of the seed sown during the centuries. As the Talmud is the Bible explained, so is Reform Judaism the Bible and the Talmud evolved. One indeed may assert beyond contradiction, that there never was a period in Judaism when the distinctive note of Reform was not struck loud and long; that continuous, if not homogeneous, attempts have ever been made to select the essentials from the non-essentials, to eliminate and innovate according to what appeared fit or unfit at the time and place; and that our fearless sages hewed to the line and recked not where the chips did fall. To employ a figure borrowed from the Talmud, the religion of Israel, like the coin struck by Abraham, was stamped with youth on the one side even when it bore the engraving of age on the other.²

It is, therefore, with great pleasure, though not without much diffidence, that I undertake, in obedience to your request, to retell the tale of the Jewish Reformation and to reconstruct and outline the history of our movement as far as can reasonably be deduced from references to our voluminous literature. Aware as I am of the saying, "Throw not a stone into a well from which thou didst drink,"³ I devoutly pray that none may misinterpret my sympathy with, and tender respect for, all that is good and uplifting in the conservative wing of Judaism.

At the same time I hail with joy those enlightened souls who guided our religion in ascending to ever loftier levels; through whose efforts Judaism, though oft transplanted, has sent down new roots and shot forth fresh flowers with the "rolling of the suns;" and to whom rabbis of to-day are largely indebted for the power to teach and preach "a religion that makes all skepticism absurd."

I.

The Book of Deuteronomy deserves a leading place in the history of Reform Judaism, not only because it is first in point of time but because it is also the first in rank of the literature of the Jewish Reformation. It appeared at the time when its want was sorely felt. The long reign of Mannasseh, with its persecution and idolatry,

²BR. 97b.

³Tanhuma "Mattoth," III.

undid the few reforms in which Hezekiah sought to give effect to the ideals of Isaiah, and uprooted the seed sown by the prophets. Bamoth were reintroduced; the worship of Baal and Moloch superseded that of Jehovah; and the reformatory efforts of Josiah proved ineffectual to stem the tide of indifference to, and defection from, the faith of the fathers. It was a critical period, the prototype of many more which have occurred in the annals of Judaism. When every attempt failed, a Book was "found" (c. 700 B. C. E.) by a liberal priest and an erudite scribe, a Book which, according to the best authorities, was no other than the Book of Deuteronomy (2 *Kings* xxi. 8 f.). It was the first text-book of Reform Judaism, and its author¹ was the first known, or rather unknown, Jew who applied what Professor Lazarus calls the *scheidung und sichtung* process to the teachings and practices inculcated by his predecessors. Well did he know how to breathe through it whole-souled devotion to *God* and large-hearted tenderness toward all men.

"In the language of a loving father whose son, standing before a great goal, is warned not to lose the bright future before him through his own fault, and thus become an object of scorn and disgrace,"² the writer appeals "in accents which all can still understand . . . to motives and principles which can never lose their validity and truth, so long as human nature remains what it is."³ To him, Jews were no longer slaves (*cf. Lev.* xxv. 55), but children whose Father wishes them to know and love Him (*Deut.* iv. 35, 9; xiv. 1; xxxii. 6), and who, if He chasteneth them, it is "like a man who chasteneth his son" (viii. 6). To him, priestly exclusiveness and sacerdotal mysteries are of little consequence; sacrifices should be restricted, ceremonies may be altered (xii. 8; xxix. 11-14), and even the Sabbath was ordained for purely humanitarian reasons (v. 15; *cf. Ex.* xx. ii, xxiii. 12). Not the select few but *all* of Israel was to form a Hebrew *Ecclesia*, a priest-nation (vi. 6 f.; *cf. Ex.* xix. 6),

¹An interesting contribution to the discussion on Deuteronomy is now running in *Hashshiloah* (Feb., 1910). From the style and spirit of the book I am inclined to assume that Jeremiah was directly or indirectly responsible for its authorship. *Cf. Zunz, Ges. Schrift.*, I. 219-22.

²Graetz. *Hist. of the Jews*, Eng. tr., I., 292, J. P. S. A.

³Driver, *Comm. on Deut.*, XIII., XXV., N. Y., 1895.

and the Law was to be decentralized and popularized and made a true "heritage of the (entire) congregation of Israel" (xxx. 12, xxxiii. 4).

That this remarkable Book should have exerted the epochal influence ascribed to it in the Bible and by tradition, can be explained only on the ground that it was a "reformulation, and adaptation to new needs, of an older legislation."⁴

Judaism has from the first harbored two distinct and frequently antagonistic tendencies which may be described, in preference to the more technical but less general terms, "prophetic" (J. E.) and "priestly" (P),—as Rational and Traditional, Practical and Theoretical, or Realistic and Romantic. Each of them had its followers, *and each of them prevailed in its turn*, when conditions and circumstances favored it.⁵ The former tendency had expressed itself already during Biblical times in abrogating some laws and modifying others. It was noticed by the Talmudists that many statutes, such, for instance, as those concerning a profligate son, a faithless wife, a perverted city and an infected house, "never have been nor ever will be enforced."⁶ It was the same with regard to the Sabbathical year (*Shmittah*) which was allowed to fall into desuetude.⁷ We know that the Abrahamic rite was not observed from the time of the Exodus till the landing in Canaan, for the reason, given by the rabbis, "that the fatigue of travel or the exigencies of war made it inadequate," even as Solomon, for like reasons, suspended the Day of Atonement, and Joshua and Saul did not celebrate Sukkoth (1 *Kings* viii. 65).⁸ The congenital holiness of the first-born (*Ex.* xxii. 28) was later rendered redeemable by a piacular substitute (*Ib.* xiii. 13; xxxiv. 20), and finally entirely replaced by the consecration of the Levites (*Num.* iii. ii-13).⁹ A similar transformation took place with the Levirate marriage, which was at first obligatory

⁴*Ib.*, LXI.

⁵See Lazarus, *Ethik des jdtms.*, §§46, 54, 157, Frankfort o. t. m., 1898. (Same parag. in Eng. tr., J. P. S. A.)

⁶*Sanh.*, 71-a.

⁷Zunz, *Gott. Vortr.*, 11-12, Frankfort o. t. m., 1892.

⁸*Ibam.*, 41b, *Erub.* 33b.

⁹Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*, 464-5, London, 1901.

(*Gen.* xxxviii. 8, *Lev.* xvii. 16), then optional (*Deut.* xx. 7, *Ruth* iv.), and lastly abolished altogether.¹⁰ We are told also of certain constructive reforms, such as the erection of a brazen altar by Solomon, which was a disregard of the express command that an altar should be made of stone or, preferably, of earth (*Ex.* xx. 24-5);¹¹ the institution of a Second Passover (*Pesah Sheni*) by Hezekiah (2 *Chron.* xxx.), and the change in the order of months made by Ezra the Scribe (*cf.* *Ex.* xii. 2).

The rise and decline of the priesthood and the sacerdotal cult, is another indication of the triumph of Rationalism in its conflict with Traditionalism. That the priesthood was an inrooted institution in Judaism, the whole Law bears ample evidence. To many, the priests' praxis constituted the entire Law; and, indeed, nearly one-third of the Pentateuch is devoted to it. The priests, too, were the guardians and guides of the people in all matters pertaining to religious welfare; their functions were not only to teach God's commandments to Jacob (*Deut.* xxxiii. 8-11), but to lead in peace and in war. But this was not acceptable to the Rational tendency in Judaism, which denied the prerogative of the priesthood. Were not the priests, like the rest of the Jews, tabooed from approaching Mount Sinai to witness the greatest event of all times, the promulgation of the Decalogue (*Ex.* xix. 24), and did not their prestige suffer greatly when they were proved to have been the chief instigators in making the Golden Calf (*Id.* xxxii. 26-8)?

To the writer in *Numbers* (xxxii. 28) therefore Eliezer the High Priest, Joshua the servant of Moses, and the elders of the people were all alike. Solomon reserved for himself the right to appoint to the high priesthood whomever he pleased (I. *Kings* ii. 27). The same policy was pursued by David and Jehoshaphat (1 *Chr.* xxiii. 13 f.; 2 *Chr.* xix. 8; xxxv. 3), and Ezekiel, himself a priest, assigns in his eschatology the place of honor to the Prince (*Nasi*, xlv. 2-3). Haggai not only shows decided preference for Zerubbabel but humorously exposes the quibblings of the priests (ii. 10-14), while Malachi (ii. 2, 9) ruthlessly attacks the whole dynasty and com-

¹⁰Mielziner, *Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce*, 54-7, N., 1901).

¹¹For which reason, according to Wellhausen (*Proleg.*, 3d. 45), no mention thereof is made in I. *Kings*, viii. Cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, 485-9.

paring the offspring of Aaron with their illustrious progenitor, he gives vent to his outraged feelings in the words: "I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings: yea . . . I also made you contemptible and base before all the people according as you have not kept My ways."

Here we find the first symptoms of a departure from Orthodoxy, the first breaking with precedent, the first denial of Authority. Traditionalism insisted (*Ex.* xxii. 28): "Thou shalt not revile the gods (or those in authority)," etc. Rationalism would say: "It means only when they work for the benefit of the people."¹² Nor was this merely a protest against the priesthood as such; the whole system of sacerdotalism fell equally into disfavor. Need I remind you of the sublime words of Solomon in his dedication address (1 *Kings* viii. 41-3; 3 *Chr.* vi. 32-3) or of Isaiah (lvi. 7) that "My house shall be a house of prayers to all the nations;" of Samuel that "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to harken than the fat of rams" (1 *Sam.* xv. 13 f.); the vehement outcry of Isaiah (i. 2 f.) against "vain oblations" and incense abominations; the invectives of Amos (v. 21-4) against burnt-offerings and meat-offerings; the portrayal of a new spiritual covenant by Jeremiah (xxxi. 26-33); the declaration of Hosea (vi. 6) that God desires mercy and not sacrifice, and knowledge more than burnt-offerings; and the assertion of the Psalmist (li. 18, 19) that the only sacrifice of God is a broken spirit, reaffirmed in *Proverbs* (xxi. 3, 27) and in fact throughout Holy Writ? How well they succeeded can be seen from the steady rise of the lay prophet and decline of the sacerdotal priest. It was the former and not the latter who kept sway over sovereign and subject alike (1 *Sam.* xiii.; xv. 14; ii.; xii.; xxiv. 10-14; 1 *Kings* xxi. 17 f. *passim*). It was to the prophets that those anxious for knowledge repaired on the festivals (2 *Kings* iv. 23). Not Eli the High Priest, but Samuel the prophet who "reasoned" the people into a righteous and rational life (1 *Sam.* ii. 26; xii. 7), became the dominant figure in Israel's history during the Biblical period: not Joshua the High Priest, but Ezra the Scribe who preferred the pen and book to the mitre and breast-plate and "caused

¹²Cf. *B. Q.*, 41b, and *Psal.*, 22b.

the people to understand the Law" (*Neh.* viii. 2 ; xii. 43),¹³ was the prominent Israelite of the post-Exilic era. Some zealous Reformer ventured even to insert in the very code of the priesthood as the reason for sacrifices to God, that the Jews "shall no more offer their sacrifices unto the devils" (*Lev.* xvii. 7), thus dealing a blow to both the priesthood and their office, while Jeremiah (xv. 1) and a Psalmist (xcix. 6) singled out Samuel as the equal of Moses himself. It was in this spirit that a later rabbi made bold to assert that Samuel was worth both Aaron and Moses combined, and that had not Moses preceded him as Israel's law-giver, the honor would have of right devolved upon Ezra.¹⁴

II.

For Ezra was indeed the spiritual heir of the prophets and as a descendant of the liberal Hilkiah and the disciple of the learned Barukh, the amanuensis of Jeremiah,¹ he was destined by nurture and by nature to be the great re-interpreter of Judaism. If some of his actions and utterances appeal to us as limitations, we must not forget that as an ardent patriot he labored not only for the purification of his religion but also for the rehabilitation of his nation. He was the first priest who was unequivocally opposed to priesthood, and whose ideal was the decentralization and popularization of the Law which his priestly colleagues claimed as, by right divine, solely theirs to be kept hidden under the cherubim in the Holy Ark. To him, priests and laymen, rich and poor, were under the same obligation, and in his book there is a striking disregard for popular traditions and supposedly historical incidents.² He became the center of a coterie composed of priests, scribes, psalmists, prophets and laymen, all of whom worked for the upliftment of Israel, and through their efforts the seed sown by the Deuteronomists began to flower and produce some fruits. Like the early Rationalists they adhered to the doctrine of Hebrew *Ecclesia* (*Ex.* xix.

¹³Graetz, *op. cit.* Heb. tr. 269-n., Warsaw, 1905.

¹⁴Bam. R., XVIII, 7 ; San., 21-b ; and see Geiger, *Das Jdtm. u. s. Gesch.*, 56, 91, 174-f., Breslau, 1910.

¹Shir Hash., R. V. 4.

²Cheyne, *Jewish Rel. Life After the Exile*, 77-84, N. Y. & London, 1898.

6; *Num.* xvi. 3); but they did not stop here. They maintained it too narrow a program for the Servant of God, "To raise up the tribe of Jacob, and restore the preserved of Israel;" his mission properly should consist in being "As a light to the nations, that My deliverance may reach to the end of the earth." (*Is.* xlix. 5, 6.)

It was probably during this time that the universalistic prophecies and psalms had their origin, and the Wisdom literature came into vogue. The *beau ideal* of this enlightened group was that knowledge be increased; and their *credo*, that all, not merely priests or Levites, nor even Jews alone, but all "that be wise shall shine as the brightness of heaven; and (all) they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." (*Dan.* xii. 3-4.) Thus before the destruction of the temple, and within a stone's throw of it, hundreds of synagogues sprang up on all sides, until they reached the formidable number of 460 or 480.³ To further facilitate and popularize the acquisition of knowledge, a radical reform was introduced into the Torah itself,—the writing of it in the script common to all;⁴ which, judging from later endeavors to attribute this innovation to the prophets and even to Moses, must have encountered, like all reforms, considerable opposition. Moreover, the Torah was divided into books, chapters and sentences, in which certain expressions and narrations were altered, or emended, or omitted, when recited, out of "respect for the public."⁵ In those synagogues, and corresponding with the hours of the quotidian sacrifices, short simple prayer-services were conducted, during which, especially on Saturdays, holidays and, later, on Mondays and Thursdays, was read the Torah, and at which the laymen received the same recognition as the priests and Levites.⁶ True, the latter were still given precedence when "called up" to the Law; but this was rather "for the sake of peace," and the order was not unseldom disregarded when an "Israelite" of prominence attended the services.⁷ The syn-

³*J. Kthub.*, 35-b; *Mgil.*, 26-a; *J. Mgil.*, 73-b.

⁴*Cf. Aboth*, v. 9 (based on *Ex.*, xxxii., 16), and *San.*, 21-2; *Zbah.*, 62.

⁵*Ndar.*, 37-b; *Mgil.*, 25; *Sofr.*, ix., 8-9; *Rashi*, I. *Chr.*, 7, and *Rdaq*, II. *Sam.*, xv., 21.

⁶*Cf. B. Q.*, 82-a.

⁷*Gitt.*, 59.

agogue thus marked the disintegration of the Temple-cult, and reverence for scholarship thus gradually superseded awe of the priesthood. It finally became a common maxim that every table whereon the Law is studied is "The table before God" (altar, *cf. Ex. xx. 24*); that one day devoted to study is worth more than a thousand hecatombs; that teaching the Torah is more valuable than building the Temple; that God is to be found only in the synagogue; and that whoever knows and observes the Law, be he even a Gentile, nay, a bastard, is as good and great as the High Priest himself (*cf. Lev. xviii. 5*).⁸

These incipient Reforms, which through the influence of Ezra were started in the "land of Israel," were carried to still greater length in places outside of Palestine, *viz.*, in Egypt, and notably in Alexandria. In that state and city, where Jews already lived in great numbers during the second commonwealth, there developed a strong Rationalistic tendency which aimed at lightening the burdens imposed by the rigid Orthodoxy of the Holy Land. Speaking the Greek language, participating in Greek culture, surrounded by the art, science and refinement for which Egypt was then famous, privileged and prosperous, the Jews there became "Greek not only in language but also in mind." It was a time, too, strikingly similar to the time of Geiger; when, embittered by the malice of anti-Semitic diatribes and attracted by the charms of an alluring philosophy, many began to desert the fold; and when men like Geiger would naturally exert themselves to preclude indifference on the one hand and disaffection on the other. This was done in almost the same manner as it took place two thousand years later. In Egypt, "the cradle of the nation," Jews first broke with the tradition which declared Palestine and the Temple the backbone and life-blood of Judaism. Jeremiah, during his visit (*Jer. xlv.*), must have repeated to them also the advice he gave to the exiles in Babylon, "To seek the peace of the city...and pray to the Lord for it" (*xxxx. 7*); and the silent centuries still further contributed to the trend toward Hellenization. The sentiment which prompted Joshua to threaten the two tribes and a half with extermination,

⁸*Aboth*, III., 3-7 *A. Z.* 3-a; *Shabb*, 30-a; *Mgil.*, 16-b.; *Peah*, I., 1.

because they set up an altar on the other side of the Jordan (*Josh.* xxii. 9 f.), and which filled David with desperation because, being driven out of Palestine, it seemed to him as if it had been said to him, "Go serve other gods" (1 *Sam.* xxvi. 19),—appealed little to the Egyptian Jews. They instituted a Sanhedrin of their own, did not care to return with the rest of the captivity during the time of Ezra nor did they yield implicit obedience to the many observances which characterized Palestinian Judaism after the great Reformer's death.⁹ For the first time in Jewish history they erected a magnificent Temple outside of Palestine, with a ritual which combined the spirituality of the synagogue with the decorum of the Temple; and it was not long ere it became a powerful rival to the Jerusalem sanctuary, and ere it was declared concerning it "That he who hath not seen it hath not seen the glory of Israel."¹⁰ Indeed, the Alexandrian Jews were an ambitious class. While they endeavored to retain those of their own race, they conceived the Jewish mission to consist in winning over the Gentile world to the teachings of their sacred religion. In the spirit of the prophetic school they proclaimed that "the children of Israel shall mark out the path of light to all mortals, for they are the interpreters of God, exalted by Him, and bearing a great joy to all mankind."¹¹ This ideal led them, on the one hand, to try to reconcile their fate with the prevailing philosophy, and, on the other, to introduce the Bible to the outside world by translating it into Greek. And their sanguine expectations seemed to have been realized to the full. What the transliteration of the Torah did for the Jews in Palestine, the translation thereof did for their co-religionists in Egypt. In a foreign land and in a foreign tongue, the Bible began to be studied as never before. A new school of preaching rabbis was formed which, like the "sons of the prophets," disseminated Judaism not only among their own people but also among non-Jews; and conversion to Judaism, judging from contemporary reports, was continually on the increase both in Egypt

⁹See Frankel, *Ueber Palast. u. Alexand. Schriftforschung* Breslau 1854. Bentwich, *Philo*, J. P. S. A. Dei Rossi, *Imre Binah*, ch. V; Levinsohn, *Tudat Byisrael*, 54. Warsaw, 1901.

¹⁰Minah 109-. Suk. 51 b.

¹¹*Orac. Syb.*, ed. Alexandre 111. 195 quoted by Bentwich, *op. cit.*

and in Rome.¹² Little wonder, then, that while the Palestinian Traditionalists spoke derogatorily of the Septuagint, because "The treasures of Israel never should have been exposed to the outside world;"¹³ the Rationalists, regarding it as a favorable means of bringing about a better understanding between Jew and Gentile, as a shield against anti-Semitism and a bait for the estranged, celebrated the day of its completion (observed in Palestine as a fast day) as a leading holiday.¹⁴ And well they might; without it Jews might never have had a Philo, whose *Life of Moses* and *On the Decalogue* form perhaps the first catechism—I had almost said *Shulhan Arukh*—of Reform Judaism.

III.

At the same time that "enlargement and deliverance" rose to the Jews and Judaism in the very place where their people were first in the bondage of body and soul, and while the Philonic school with its allegorizing preacher-rabbis sought to rationalize their faith and emphasize the mission of Israel, a contemporary of Philo was laboring for the salvation of his race and religion in their native land. Liberal Palestinian Judaism found its most splendid exponent in the illustrious Hillel Hannasi, who later generations included in the same category with Ezra and Moses.¹ His lot fell at a time when the great national tragedy was imminent, and when the national instinct of self-preservation asserted itself in advocating a religion of rigorism and asceticism. The dominant note of the day was separation and exclusiveness. Whatever distinguished Jew from Gentile came to be regarded as Jewish and sacred. The number of Nazarites grew, and Essenism spread far and wide.² "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand," was the cry; and, in response to it, people gave up their belongings, mourned even on the Sabbath,³ and

¹²Hudkoper, *Judaism at Rome*, Boston 1900, *passim*. Bentwich *op. cit.* 32, 115.

¹³*Sofr.* i. 8; *Tanh* "Ki Tisa" 34; *Shmoth R.* 47.

¹⁴Tebeth 8, *Mgil.* 9 b. Yalq. "Bresh." 61.

¹*Suk.* 20a, 48. *San* 11, 42.

²Josephus, *Ant.* XIX. vi. XV. X. 5; *Wars*, II. viii. 3; 1 *Macc.* iii. 49.

³*Judith* viii, 5-6 *Jubilee* end.

tried to avert the awful doom by strict adherence to ceremonial law.⁴ At the conference convoked by the Zealot (Elazar b.) Hanania, several years before the dissolution of the Jewish state, the Traditionalists made a bold assault on the Rationalists and finally carried the day.⁵ It was decreed that not only intermarriage be forbidden but that all intercourse with Gentiles be discontinued, and that all countries lying outside of Palestine be held in a state of uncleanness. These "eighteen articles" of separation were declared as so imperative that Elijah himself could never abrogate them.⁶ Henceforth, Kuthites, Sadducees, Angushites (?), etc., were to be shunned, and the testimony of a tax-collector for the Romans was not to be accepted.⁷ "Ye shall not walk in their ordinances" (*Lev.* xviii. 3), was construed to contain an indictment of whatever was not Jewish. Thus R. Ishmael warned against Greek philosophy, R. Aquiba proposed to ban all non-Biblical books; and the hint was given that the deliverance of Israel would be effected again, as it had been once before, if Jews changed not their traditional nomenclature, language and dress.⁸

Needless to say, that many of these decretals were seldom, if ever, carried into effect. At best, they proved mere pious wishes, or practices of the over-zealous few. Especially is this true with regard to the last statement anent Jewish names, language and garb. Judging from the terms applied to articles of dress in the earliest rabbinic writings, we can safely assert that their form and style became Hellenic and Roman soon after the Jews migrated to those countries, and continued to change with time and place.⁹ They certainly did not cling to Biblical names, as the Bible itself, not to say the Talmud and post-Talmudic literature, bears witness.¹⁰ But nothing illustrates so well what Zunz calls the *Einbuergerung* of a foreign language than the gradual denization of the Greek and Ara-

⁴Cf. *San* 88 b (anent philacteries).

⁵*Shabb.* 13 b f., esp. 17a; cf. Graetz, *op. cit.* Heb. tr. II. 89n. 2.

⁶*A. Z.* 36a-37b.

⁷*R. H.* 22a. *J. R. H.* 14; *Psah.* 51a. *Mak.* 5b. *San.* 25b 74b; *Joma* 9b.

⁸*Mid. Thilim* cxiv. *Leqah* 7 ob. "Shmoth" vi. *Min.* 99; *Mgil.* 25a; *San.* 11a; *Hag.* 15b.

⁹See *Jewish Encycl.*, Art. Costume."

¹⁰*Ib.* Art. "Names."

maic. The slow but potent hand of time accomplished what the enlightened leaders were striving for, only that it frequently occurred after it had ceased to be a reformation. Despite the vehement protests against Greek "wisdom" and the Greek tongue in general, Greek finally came to be tolerated as a necessary evil for "those who are near the rulers," then venerated for its beauty and antiquity, then consecrated until prayers were permitted to be recited in it, Biblical portions to be read from it, and translations into it were not only recommended but even decreed. Indeed, next to Hebrew itself it came to be regarded as the most sacred of languages, and on Aquila's translation of the Bible was quoted (*Ps. xlv.*), "Thou art fairer than the children of men, grace is poured into thy lips."¹¹ As late as the middle of the sixth century we read of a heated controversy which took place in Constantinople as to whether the Law should be read in Greek or in the original Hebrew;¹² and at a still later period, the author of the Zohar ventured the statement that "without a blemish" (*Num. xix. 2*) is applicable to the Greek nation ("Because of its near approach to the paths of belief").¹³ The same is true as regards Aramaic.

In Palestine, Nehemiah launched a protest against those who used it in preference to Hebrew (*xiii. 24*), and in Babylon R. Josie advocated the use of either Hebrew or Persian.¹⁴ For many years, it would appear the Targum was looked upon as, in various respects, inferior to the Septuagint or Aquila's translation,¹⁵ and R. Johanan advised never to pray in the Aramaic tongue.¹⁶ Yet the Targum ultimately assumed an importance second only to the original text, in connection with which it had to be read every week;¹⁷ the precept of a certain Tanna was, not to make light of the language itself,¹⁸ and the prayers offered in the whilom proscribed language were retained not only by the Orthodox but even in the Union Prayer Book

¹¹*Sotah* 49 b; *Mgil.* 9b; *J. Sot.* viii. 1; *Mgil.* 1b. iii.

¹²*Zunz, op. cit.* 10-11, 427; *Graetz, op. cit., H. t., III.* 398.

¹³"Smoth" 237a.

¹⁴*B. Q.* 83a, *Sot.* 49b.

¹⁵*Cf. Shabb* 115a & *Rashi ad—100.*

¹⁶*Shabb.* 12b; *Sotah* 32b.

¹⁷*Tur. O. H.* 145; *Hazzofeh Lhammaggid* III, 34.

¹⁸*Sot.* vii. 2.

and Union Haggadah published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis! Well indeed might a modern editor predict that English, which many an Orthodox rabbi seeks now to exclude from the New York Hadarim and Yshiboth, will eventually become a Yiddish English, and "a Chernowitch Conference at the opening of the twenty-first century will stamp the English jargon as the national language of the Jew."

But it is to Hillel Hannasi (110 ? B. C. E.—10 C. E.) that we are indebted for the first direct attempt at repudiating the authority of the Traditionalists and putting a check on the fanaticism of them that walked in darkness. In his saying, "If I am not for myself, who will be; and if I am for myself only, who am I; and if not now, when?"¹⁹ Geiger sees the first clarion call for concerted action in behalf of Reform Judaism.²⁰ But even more explicit is his advice, which struck at the root of Orthodoxy, not to promulgate doctrines which can not be accepted, lest they be accepted.²¹ Pseudo-piety he despised; every day, to him, brought with it its sacred duty, and cleanliness and hygiene formed part of his religion.²² By means of his seven hermeneutic principles (later amplified to thirteen and afterward developed to thirty-two), he rendered Judaism a religion which may expand and contract to suit times and circumstances.²³

With Hillel and his mighty opponent Shammai the two streams pouring into the river-bed of Judaism began their headlong rush, and their disciples and followers, who possessed their zeal but lacked their genius, almost "tore the Torah in twain."²⁴ The masters themselves, however, maintained the most amicable relation in their war "in the name of Heaven." They often changed sides when reason and mature deliberation convinced them of the truth of the opposite argument. They never allowed the battle of words to become an

¹⁹*Aboth* I. 14.

²⁰*Op. cit.* 105-6. Geiger in all his writings maintains that the Sadduceans represented the old polity, while the Pharisees were Reformers. Shammai was a follower of the former, Hillel of the latter. See *Heholmz*, 1862, vi. 13-30.

²¹See Weiss, *Dor Dor Vdorshav* I. 162.

²²*Aboth* ii. 5. *Bezah* 16a; *Brak.* 63a; *Vayiq.* R. 34.

²³See *J. Psah.* vi. i.

²⁴*San* 88b. *Cf. Psah.* 51a.

onslaught of personalities.²⁵ True, this peaceful propensity was due to Hillel who, like Aaron, "loved peace and pursued it." But Shammai, too, sometimes yielded to the force of public sentiment, and thus, though his party prevailed at the Hananyah Conference, its decrees were held in abeyance during the life of Hillel.

In looking for citations concerning the controversies between Hillel the liberal—the first to enunciate the Golden Rule, for which he was never given credit by those who pretended to follow it²⁶—and Shammai the conservative, the conviction grows upon every unbiased student that the cultured Traditionalists were followers of the former, while the strict Rationalists, and the masses, who are ever overawed by the authority of tradition, though at first admirers of the Babylonian savant, finally decided in favor of the latter. Has it not always been the case in every movement which has as its object the civil or religious emancipation of the human race? And has it not always been the truth that the ideals of the Reformer, albeit by slight degrees and in the face of opposition and denunciation, ultimately gains realization; that "the germs once implanted the growth though slow is sure"? It was so with the Hillelites. The radical reforms introduced by Hillel with regard to the Shmitah and the redemption of a house,²⁷ suggested and encouraged many others. Nazarism and asceticism were declared to be sinful, as was also the giving away of more than one-fifth of one's possession.²⁸ Pre-eminent among these enlightened leaders was R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, the "right pillar" to maintain the fabric of Reform Judaism, and "mighty hammer" to shatter and destroy whatever hindered its onward progress. From the start he expressed his dissatisfaction with the ritual sanctity of Jerusalem by establishing a Sanhedrin in Yamnia, and assuming the right there to judge criminal cases. He further made it easy for those who wished to return to the fold, and treated and greeted Jew and Gentile in the same spirit of peace.²⁹ In Yamnia the teachings of Hillel found a host

²⁵*Aboth* i. 12, v. 20; *Min.* 9a; *Eduy.* iii. 2.

²⁶*Shabb.* 30a.

²⁷*Gitt* 36, *Erub.* 31b. See Geiger, *Sbezath Maamarim*, Warsaw, 1910, pp. 64f. on *Erub.* &c.

²⁸*Ndar.* 9-10; *Kthub.* 50a. *Qid.* end.

²⁹*Brak.* 17a, *B. Q.* 94b.

of admirers.³⁰ It was there that R. Joshua b. Hananya, astronomer and metaphysician, held up the Fanatic Essene or Pharisee to derision, and promulgated the principle basic to Reform Judaism, "Not to impose upon the public what the majority can not abide by."³¹ The conference of Hananya was to him like a conference about the Golden Calf; it will only add water, he said, to the precious oil of Judaism and will cause it to overflow and spill; and he declared once for all that the so-called supernatural voice can have no deciding power in laws which must accord with human reason.³² In Usha, too, the enlightened head of the Academy, R. Simon b. Gamaliel, laid down the principles of freedom of thought and speech, and endeavored to remove the traditional disabilities of the slave and the woman, and even of the much despised Kuthite.³³ In both Academies the principles prevailed that "whether much (ritual) or little, it matters not, if it be for the sake of Heaven;" and that "an honest day's work is as great as the observance of the whole Law."³⁴

Were I not disinclined to take advantage of your kind indulgence, I could recall to your minds the numerous host of shining lights in the firmament of Judaism, who either directly or indirectly identified themselves with the movement inaugurated by Hillel. I could remind you of R. Ishmael b. Elisha (Fabi), a bitter opponent of R. Aqiba's casuistry and defender of the rights of women and slaves,³⁵ who when reprimanded for trimming his lamp on the Sabbath gave the facetious retort, "When the Temple shall be rebuilt I will bring a fat burnt-offering as an expiation;"³⁶ of R. Gamaliel, who in a similar vein defended his treatment of his slave Tobi, "because he (Tobi) was a great Talmudist,"³⁷ and permitted and instituted many innovations for the sake of peace or reasons of progress; of the clear-minded R. Meir, who separated the orange rind from the

³⁰See my *Sect, Creed and Custom in Judaism*.

³¹*Sot.* 20a (cf. 22b); B. B. 60b.

³²*Shabb.* 17a. (Cf. *San.* 105a); B. M. 59b.

³³*Moed. Q.* iii. i; *Sot.* 3a. *Gitt.* 12a, 37b, 41a, *Kthub.* 110b., J. *Brak* vii. I.

³⁴*Brak.* 17a; *Ab. d R. M.* xvi.; *Mkhl.* "Bshal." ii.

³⁵*San.* 51b; *Sot.* 3a.

³⁶*Shabb.* 12b. See, *Tosaf. s. v. R. Nathan*.

³⁷*Suk.* 20b; *Gittin* 32a, 36a; *id.* 61a.

orange meat, the admirer of Socrates the Gentile and Elisha-Aher the ex-communicated one, who "enlightened the sages in Halakhah," and by reducing R. Akiba's method *ad absurdum* won a victory of Rational Judaism;³⁸ of R. Simon Yohai, the avowed eclectic and Rationalist, who declared Tiberias a "clean" city though built on a cemetery, and who thus disregarded the law of purity;³⁹ and of R. Yhudah Hannasi, devotee of Greek philosophy, whose proud boast it was that his eminent ancestors did not monopolize the whole realm of Reform, and who lived up to his claim by modifying the custom of announcing the new moon, by removing the rigorism from Shmittah and tithes, by lifting the ban laid by the Hananyah Conference on the intercourse between Jew and Gentile,⁴⁰ and especially by writing down the traditions in spite of the many protests against it—protests more bitter, if possible, than those which were fulminated against the Septuagint—and the assertion that "Who writes down tradition burns up the Law."⁴¹ But what I wish to remind you of is the fact, often ignored or overlooked, that these religious reforms in Judaism, unlike the civic reforms in many a Christian State concerning the Jews, did not remain *obiter dicta* even in Palestine. Thus the hot springs of Tiberias were kept open for the public on the Sabbath; the places where, for instance, R. Josi Hagglili, or R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, or R. Yhudah Hannasi resided, showed the liberal tendencies of their respective representatives; and a certain R. Isaac ventured the assertion that where the teachings of the broad-minded R. Eliezer were adopted, the people not only escaped the persecution of the tyrant but even enjoyed a good old age.⁴² How averse some of them were to Traditionalism can be seen from the statement of R. Yohanan, who called the

³⁸*Erub.* 13b. Hag. 15b. 'Tis a pity there is so little about the Acherim and the Yesh Omarim. The fact, however, that these are names, or nicknames, in the plural, indicates that R. Meir and R. Nathan were not the only ones to whom they were applied, but that there must have been schools or sects. This supposition is strengthened from the story in *Nazir* 49b and *Sidd.* 52b. . . . A treatment similar to that of the Hillelites before them.

³⁹*Gitt.* 67a; cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII; ii. 3.

⁴⁰*Hulin* 6-7; *J. Taan.* iii. 1, *J. R. H.* ii. i; *A. Z.* 36a.

⁴¹*Gitt.* 60b. *Trumah* 14b., *Tmura* 14b.

⁴²*Shabb.* 40a, 46a, 130a; *Psah* 112b, *Moed Q* 11b.

observance of a double-feast a curse rather than a blessing.⁴⁵ Insisting that the rabbis have a right divine to abrogate, modify and institute,⁴⁶ and that "*everything depends on the year, the place, the circumstances,*" they discarded many ancient rites as merely temporal and therefore no longer binding.⁴⁵ The Biblical legislation, for example, pertaining to male-purification they allowed to be honored in the breach, though the same pertaining to the female they retained (*Lev. xv*). On the other hand, the divorce laws, which are very lax in the Bible, are quite rigorous in the Mishnah.⁴⁶ Lending money on interest, which the Law allows (*Deut. xxiii. 20*), the rabbis forbade.⁴⁷ Saturday itself was to them not too sacred to relieve the sufferer and to arrange for the education, even manual, of the children; for, they claimed, it was made for men and not man for it. To avoid any possible disagreeableness they permitted that prayer be suspended in the presence of a Gentile king; that searching for leaven be abandoned in the cranny of the wall separating the home of a Jew from that of a non-Jew; that a perverted city on the boundary line could not be liable to the laws concerning it, "so as not to give the heathen cause for war;" that prayer be said in silence or by a precentor, "so as not to hurt the sensibilities of the repentant" or to relieve those who are not conversant. Through the influence of Hillel and Todos of Rome the Seer service was introduced in spite of its being so glaring an imitation of the Roman and Christian Eucharist. R. Ba pleaded for the permission to work on the semi-holidays since the people do not observe them as they should. The calendar was so contrived that the Sabbaths and holidays should not conflict with the required preparations for their celebration, and the farmers and laborers were allowed to observe even Rosh Hashshanah and Yom Hakkipurim as best they can with the least sacrifice of time and comfort.⁴⁸ Some prayers which were traditionally recited daily, they relegated to the

⁴⁵*Erubin* "Bakal Marbin."

⁴⁶*R. H.* 25.

⁴⁷*Taan.* 14b, *Brak* 10a., *J*, *Mgil.* i, 4, *R. H.* i., *Jomah* 60b.

⁴⁸*Gitt.* 32a, 90a., *Ybam.* 113b., *San* 22a.

⁴⁹*B. M.* 70b (*Cf. R. H.* i. 8).

⁵⁰*Shabb.* 132b. 150a. *Ybam* 7a. 85b; *Brak.* 19a, 32b., *R. H.* 34-5. *Taan.* iv.

holiday service; others, though they were originated by Gentiles, like the three benedictions modeled by R. Meir after those attributed to Socrates, they received into the daily ritual; while the evening service they declared as optional and several prayers or portions thereof they removed entirely. Disapproving of the traditional liturgy, some rabbis improvised liturgies of their own.⁴⁹ Though according to R. Aqiba whoever indulged in "profane" literature lost his portion in the world to come, they recommended extra-canonical books, the "wisdom" of the Greeks, the manners of the Parthians, whom they held up as worthy of emulation,⁵⁰ and to those who would prate of building "fences" for fear of the much despised *ame haarez* (illiterates), they would say in the words of R. Yohanan: "Should God destroy his world because of the fools?"⁵¹ Attached as they were to the Holy Land and the ancient Jewish notables, they yet believed with R. Simon b. Laqish that later generations were even more meritorious than the former, and with R. Simon b. Yohai that "wherever thou goest God goeth with thee;" and in their firm faith that "God hath dealt mercifully with Israel by scattering him among the nation," because he will thus be enabled to realize his mission of making proselytes or "increasing the number of the righteous ones," they rejoiced at the destruction of the Temple which, according to R. Elazar, stood like an iron wall between God and Israel!" and with "Rabbi" suggested the abolition of the fast of Tisha b. Ab.⁵² They were convinced that even as the day encroaches more and more upon the night until it illumines dale and hill with its resplendent glory, "so also will be the salvation of Israel;" they hoped for the time when even in the theaters and circuses of Edom the teachings of Judaism would be rule and guide; and they prayed for the speedy arrival of the day when the "Kingdom of the Almighty shall be established on earth, and all the chil-

⁴⁹*Shabb.* 132b. 150a. *Ybam* 7a. 85b; *Brak.* 19a, 32b., *R. H.* 34-5. *Taan.* iv. 1; *Mid. Mishle* ix. 2; *Yal. Lev.* vii. 12; *Sob.* 32b. *J. Moed Q.* 113; *San.* 16b; *Yom.* 85b.

⁵⁰See *Min* 43 b., *Brak* 26, Weiss, *op. cit.* 11. 147, Zunz, *op. cit.* 380-2 & cf., "Mah Nistanah" in *Psah.* 116a & accepted versim in *Haggadah.*

⁵¹*San.* 90a, 100b., *Hag.* 15b., *Sot.* 49b., *Brak.* 8b., *Br. R.* xxxvi. 8.

⁵²*B. B.* 89b., *A. Z.* 54b., *Cf. Ndar.* 14a, 49a., *Min* 99b., *Taan.* 26b, *Erub.* 72o.

⁵³*Brak.* 32b. *Mgil* 5; 29 *Psah.* 87b; *Dbar R.* xii. 16.

dren of flesh shall call on Thy Name . . . and recognize that to Thee alone every knee doth bend, and every tongue doth swear," and when "Palestine will be as Jerusalem, and all countries as Palestine."⁵⁸

IV.

In spite of the strenuous efforts of the Hillelites, Traditionalism was bound to prevail. The Cimmerian darkness which covered the political sky of Palestine, abruptly broke off the further expansiveness of Judaism in its native land. As the national greatness lay in the past so, the Jews naturally concluded, did also their religious greatness. Henceforth with them Judaism ceased to be creative and remained Traditional, and petrification and dogmatism were steadily on the increase.

Fortunately, a new, fresh stream began to pour into the brackish water; and like the one which emanated from the first land of bondage, Egypt, this flowed from the second land of bondage, Babylonia. By the rivers where the former exiles sat and wept when they remembered Zion, there grew up a Jewish settlement which began to dispute its power with the mother country and ultimately became victorious. Notwithstanding the decree of the Hananya Conference that all extra-Palestinian countries be held as unclean; and the repeated asseveration that it is sinful to remove from "the Land" (Palestine) to "without the Land,"¹ we are informed of tentative attempts made by Haninah, nephew of R. Joshua, and by R. Aqiba, to secure the independence and equality of Babylon.² As years passed by, the ideal had been partially realized, and the opinion obtained that the Sanhedrin could be in session without the land as well as within.³ But here it did not rest. The Babylonians became aggressive. They pointed out that whenever the Torah in Palestine had been forgotten, it was one of their own

⁵⁸*Psiq. R. i. Mid. Thilim* xxii, *Mgil* 30a, Book of Common Prayer. Most of the sayings in *San.* 98-9 indicate the belief rather in a Messianic era than in a Messianic person, and may well serve as shields and weapons in an anti-Zionistic campaign.

¹*Gitt.* 76b.

²*Brak.* 63.

³*Mak.* 7a.

(Ezra, Hillel, Hiyvah, etc.), who went there and re-established it.⁴ They, therefore, ventured to assert that to live in Babylon is just as acceptable to God as to live in Palestine; and some even retaliated by declaring it a sin to leave Babylon for Palestine.⁵ This was a victory for liberal Judaism which surpassed even that won by the Jews of Egypt. The latter, though they built a temple and translated the law, still clung to the tradition that "Out of Zion shall go forth the Torah, and the Word of God from Jerusalem" (Isa. ii); and dedicated synagog and cemeteries in the Holy Land. The former protested their superiority in every respect; snapped the cord that bound them to the land of their fathers; and claimed that if the Palestinian scholars were like men, theirs were like the very ministering angels.⁶

In this land, which the proud Palestinians derided as a "land of darkness,"⁷ the Jews found a Goshen both of civic and religious light. They were hospitably entreated by those in authority, and their intercourse with their Gentile neighbors was unimpeded. Grateful for their pleasant lot, they paid no heed to the strictures and rigorisms of the Traditionalists; and as a mark of appreciation counted their dates in accordance with the common era, not as was customary, from the creation of the world or the destruction of the temple.⁸ There, the shackle of tradition was shaken off; religion was made to conform to life. New customs were introduced, old ones abrogated, and the saying obtained that "wherever thou goest follow the customs of the place." Mar Samuel, on whom fell the mantle of Hillel, among other minor innovations advocated the reformation of the calendar, the emancipation of woman, the inhibition of priesthood and the abrogation of Tithes and fast-days.¹⁰ Not satisfied with the principle that "even if a law is regarded as

⁴*Suk.* 20a.

⁵*Kthub.* 110.

⁶See *Mgil.* 26a., *Qidd.* 72a; *Nazir*, 52a.

⁷*Brak.* 25b. *San.* 24; *Min.* 52.

⁸*A. Z.* 10a, 15-16; *Psah.* 30b. *J. Psah.* ii. 2; *Bresh. R.* xi. 3.

⁹*Br. R.* 48; *Hul.* 5b, 95b, *B. Q.* 80a. *B. M.* 46b. *A. Z.* 36; *Gitt.* 6, *R. H.* 18b.

¹⁰*San.* 11a. *Kthub.* 43b, *Qid.* 70b, *Taan.* 11a, *Psah.* 30a, 54b. *R. H.* 20b; *Bkhor.* 27a.

lax in the 'land' it is the law outside of 'the land,'"¹¹ he deprecated the half-reforms of Hillel, which he denominated "the disgrace of the judges;" proclaimed his famous legal maxim that "the law of each place must be abided by the people of that particular place;" doubted the purity of the Jewish race; taught that the "Days of the Millenium" mean only days of complete freedom and peace, and carried his ardor for Reform to the extent of threatening Rab with excommunication for teaching that a certain food was ritually unclean.¹²

Dr. Zunz has presented us in his *magnum opus* with the evolution of the Jewish sermon, and Professor Bacher with the history of Agada, and we now know that not only teaching but also preaching is a long established institution in Judaism. But what is of special interest to us here is, that, like the preacher-rabbis of Alexandria, the Agada-rabbis of Palestine, and especially of Babylon, were the banner-bearers of Reform, absolute as well as relative. Agadists, says M. Derenbourg,¹³ were "no longer interpreters of the law, but preachers of a socialistic temper, like the old prophets." Had it been otherwise, the conservative R. Joshua b. Lakish would not have boasted, as did the "Rosh" later with regard to philosophy, that he never glanced at an Agada book in his life; and R. Isaac would not have expressed the opinion that people rush to hear words of Agada because the law is not generally known. Nor, on the other hand, would the Agadaist have been called "the wise," or Agada so extolled as to be regarded the best means to "recognize Him who spake and the world was."¹⁴ Like the sacred fire which, according to legend, was buried by Jeremiah only to be exhumed by Nehemiah,¹⁵ the fire of Rationalism which was hidden by the allegorists of Egypt and the Targumists of Palestine was re-kindled and spread abroad by the Agadaists of Babylon.

But to form a correct portraiture of the Jewish Reform move-

¹¹Brak. 36a; Shabb. 139a.

¹²Gitt. 36b, 10a. A. Z. 36a (Tos. s. v. "Asher").

¹³Quoted by Dr. Kohler *J. Q. R.* V. 399. *Qid.* 70b; Brak. 34b, Shabb. 13a.

¹⁴Cf. Zunz, *op. cit.* 64, 358 f. & *J. Shabb.* xvi. 5, with Hag. 11-16: *Sifri* "Ekeb."

¹⁵Taan 30b.

ment in Babylonia, we must needs resort to the great compilation for which that land will ever remain famous in Israel's history. If the Talmud, in the beautiful simile of Professor Delitzsch,¹⁶ is "an enormous theatre, in which thousands and thousands of voices, from at least five centuries, speak in confusion," there are not lacking hundreds and hundreds of voices that plead for Reform. I feel, indeed, a veritable *embarras des richesses* when I behold these treasures of ancient liberal Judaism, and deeply deplore the dullness of my tools and the smallness of my coffer compared to the multitude of these invaluable nuggets. All I can do is to select a few specimens, assort them under their proper labels, and together with what I have already touched upon in the previous section, try to reconstruct the actual contents of Reform Judaism of that time and place.

Consider first of all the liberalism which prompted the Babylonian redactors of the Talmud to give place to these contradictory and cancelling opinions. Does it not indicate the esteem in which they were held even by the conservatives? Would they not have been suppressed even as were certain Mishnayoth by R. Yhudah Hannasi, and certain Biblical books by the Men of the Great Assembly?¹⁷ Or was it that they did not dream of a future *scheidung und sichtung*, and have thus innocently contributed to strengthen the enemy against whom they waged internecine war? Whatever the reason or cause the damaging (?) evidence was retained, and a latter-day Reform rabbi may well pronounce over them the benediction of Ben-Zoma, at the sight of a Jewish multitude: "Praised be He, who created them to serve me."¹⁸

Orthodoxy insists on the worship of the past. Its quaint essence consists in being unalterably opposed to innovation. It teaches that "the nail of the ancients was better than the loins of the moderns;" that "the heart of the former was like the gate of a palace, while ours is like the eye of the needle;" that "if our ancestors were mere men we are like asses, yea, not even like the

¹⁶*Jewish Artizan Life in the Time of Christ*, Eng. tr. 26. London & N. Y. 1902.

¹⁷*Mgil.* 14.

¹⁸*Brakh.* 58a. Cf. *Minah.* 1b.

asses of Ben Dosa and Ben Yair." To make change absolutely impossible, it further declares that "He who differs from his master is as if he denied his God."¹⁹ And since the only condition which rendered the slightest departure from authority permissible was that the latter Beth Din be superior to the former not only in numbers but also in knowledge, it eviscerated the very vitals of Reform; and if some innovation was unavoidable it had to be grafted, sometimes in a very ingenious though very illogical manner on some ancient, frequently withered, limb of the tree of Judaism.²⁰ The conservatives graded the material and animal creation according to certain degrees of sanctity; Palestine was distinguished from the rest of the globe, the Jew from the rest of mankind. These were further divided into various classes, each of which had its special privileges and particular obligations; Jerusalem had its rights and duties, Galilee likewise its own; man his, woman hers; the priests formed a caste by themselves; women, slaves and children severally by themselves. All these obligations had to be accepted as *gzeroth* (behests), even if they contained a kernel of material or intellectual enjoyment.²¹ No reasoning about the commandments was to be tolerated, since *Qui s'excuse s'accuse*, and the only nostrum for piety is *Credo quia impossibile est*. Only Moses was privileged to know the reasons of most of the laws; and when a student, of his own accord, succeeded in reading the riddle of a *Mizrah*, he was inhibited from imparting his discovery to others.²² This was not limited to the Biblical legislation. Rabbinical ordinances were not explained to pupils until after a period of at least twelve months.²³ Overawed by the authority of antiquity, fearing to transgress the least of the traditional customs, they heaped restrictions upon restrictions; would disallow to the ignorant the very things with which they favored the learned, and avoided one thing lest it might lead to another, or because there was the least doubt about its permissibility.²⁴ They believed that all laws were equally

¹⁹Jomah 9b., Erub. 53a. Shabb. 112b., Bam. R. xviii. 15.

²⁰Edu. 2a., A. Z. 36a., San. 11a.

²¹Bam. R. xix. 1. Mgil. 25a. . . R. H. 28, & see Lazarus, *op. cit.* App. 18.

²²Brakh. 28b., Psah. 119a. Bam. R. xix. 4.

²³A. Z. 35a-36.

²⁴A. Z. 36. Shabb. 40a. Hul. 15a., Psah. 110b.

binding, and that it is a Jew's duty to observe them all; or, as was the case with the sacrifices, to study and know about them, so that when the redemption comes they should not smack of "innovations."²⁵

It was otherwise with the Rationalists. They would differentiate between Tradition and Traditionalism, and reserve the right of reason as to which to select and which to reject from the mass of Jewish ceremonials.²⁶ Emboldened by the *Lehrfreiheit* which prevailed in the schools of Hillel, they let tradition pass through the sieve of reason, and would not impugn criticism as bordering on skepticism. The Torah to them was "like wheat to be ground into flour; like flax, to be spun into cloth;" it was not intended for ministering angels but for man to live by; it, therefore, can be renewed or altered when required, it will be renewed and altered at the coming Millennium.²⁷ Accordingly, they would not hesitate to declare their preference for R. So-&So, to ask upon what ground was formulated law such-&-such, to learn from "the whole world," and to esteem observation more convincing than Tradition.²⁸ Ben Mahallel, Rish Lakish and R. Elazar they reproved for their bias to tradition. The words of no man, be he never so great, should carry the weight of authority from Heaven, whither nobody ever went and came back to tell the tale.²⁹ They called a spade a spade, and minced no words when some rabbinical disquisition was deemed by them as sleep-talk, bagatelle and exaggeration, as mountains suspended on a hair, as attempts to pass an elephant (*pil*, punning on *Pilpul*) through the eye of a needle, as a doctrine long outworn or fit only for the Messianic age, as straining at gnats and swallowing camels.³⁰

This bold outspokenness was not limited merely to the Amaraïm or even to the Tannaim. In the Mishnah itself—which the con-

²⁵Hul. 5a., Sifri, "Dbarim," xi. 17. Vay. R. vii. 3.

²⁶See Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, 7, 65. N. Y. 1907.

²⁷Min. 1b., 9a., Brakh. 25b; Yomah v. 2, Ybam. 62b., San. 100b; Mkhil. "Bshal," i.

²⁸B. B. 142b., R. H. 25b. Hul. 18b, & see Zweifel, *Sanegor*, 75, 122-3, 211-22.

²⁹Suk. 28a. B. B. 12b., Mak. 23b.

³⁰Bkhor. 23b., 45a. Hul. 90b. Suk. 28a. B. B. 12. B. Q. 94b. San. 51b. A. Z. 37b; & see Bacher, *Agada d. bab. Amaraer*, 77n. 5. Strassburg. 1878. J. Psah. ii. 2; B. M. 38b.

servatives came to revere as next to the Bible and to relish as "a continuous feast"—the Rationalists pointed out redundancies and suggested emendations.⁸¹ Even the Bible, every passage, derivative, dot or hint of which was to the Traditionalists equally holy and inspired, to them was "not a seed, but a model," the growth of which may be pruned and trimmed and grafted, or, in the words of Professor Butcher, as the "one Book which appears to have capacity of eternal self-adjustment, of uninterrupted correspondence with an ever-shifting and ever-widening environment."⁸²

They venerated, they did not worship. Far from being Bibliolators, they pronounced that the Scriptures "spoke in the language of men," and that, therefore, no passage can have any other meaning but what is on the surface.⁸³ They passed judgments on the deeds and doctrines of the Bible heroes; averred that Moses himself had his limitations and could not foresee the developments of the Law brought about by the potent hand of time; affirmed that some of his laws had to be abolished by the prophets, and that many of his contemporaries were fonder of Aaron than of his immortal brother; and hence they concluded that the generation (of, *e. g.*, R. Yhudah) which feared God, is more to be respected than that of Moses, and that a truth told by the least of the Israelites should be as acceptable as if it were uttered by Moses. In a word, "Jerubaal in his generation is to be listened to as was Moses in his, and every court should enjoy the respect which would be accorded to the court of Moses."⁸⁴

Such being their attitude toward Moses, whose "equal arose not in Israel," there is little to be surprised at in their treatment of the priesthood and the sacrificial cult. It is noteworthy that in their tracing the transmission of the Law from Moses down to the Great Assembly the priesthood is conspicuous by its absence. It was not infrequent that the decisions of the priests were overruled by a court

⁸¹*Yom.* 109b., *San.* 100b. *Taan.* I viii. 3, & see Weiss, *op. cit.* III., 20.

⁸²*Apud* Bentwich, *op. cit.*, 104. *Of. San.* 34 & 99a.

⁸³*Brakh.* 30a., 51b. *Shabb.* 63a. *Ybam.* 24a.

⁸⁴On Deborah & Hulda: *Sif* "Dbar;" on Samuel, *Vazig. R.* xxvi. See *Habboqu Or.* v. 417-33. *Min.* 29b. *Makk.* 22. *Pirge d. R. E.* xviii. *Sifri.* Shmini & "Egeb." *San.* 20a. *R. H.* 25a.

of laymen; and as to their views respecting the sacrifices we can judge from the beautiful parable about the prince who indulged in forbidden tidbits. The dictum was that a scholar comes before a priest, and that a learned bastard takes precedence over an ignorant high-priest. In the Scriptural declaration that "the years of the wicked shall be shortened," they saw an application to the period of the second Temple, and arrived at the conclusion that study, charity, prayer or honest toil possessed more value than sacrifice, and that it was more honorable to be a follower of Aaron than a descendant of Aaron. One rabbi sarcastically remarked that had he not married the daughter of a priest he would not have been "exiled from Babylon to Palestine;" and another advised that instead of wasting wine on a stony altar it would be much better to pour it into the throats of thirsty students.³⁵

It is remarkable that at comparatively so early a stage of Biblical criticism, the rabbis had already an eye to the reasonable or unreasonable interpretations of the Scriptures. They expressed themselves freely about the miracles, or explained them in such a manner that they ceased to be a break in the laws of nature;³⁶ they pointed out exaggerations and errors in the narratives,³⁷ and suggested emendations in the text.³⁸ Equally unimpeded by tradition were they with respect to the authorship of the various books and their component parts; and their opinions as to the writers of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Ruth, Chronicles, the Psalms, the Salomonic books, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, if perhaps not critically correct, are certainly psychologically significant.³⁹ With such fearless seekers after the truth, the plenary-inspiration dogma could have but little weight; and, indeed, judging from numerous remarks they denied it in part or in *toto*. Not only Ezekiel, the

³⁵Weiss, *op. cit.* 1. 22, 49, R. H. 22a. *Ndar.* 62a. *Min.* 110a. *A. Z.* 3a. *Hor.* 13a. *Brak.* 8a., 32b. *Suk.* 49b. *Yom.* 9a., 71a. *Sifra* "Ahare," xiii.

³⁶See *Hul.* 5a. *San.* 92b, *B. Q.* 60. *B. B.* 15-16; *Aboth*, v. 9; *Br. R.* i. 18; *Yohasin*, int.

³⁷*Hul.* 90b., *San.* 102a., *Mak.* 12a. *Mgil.* 12a.

³⁸*Shabb* 116a. *Midrash*, "Samuel," x. 10-16. *Tam.* "Bshal." xvi. *Sofr.* ix. 8-9. *Dei Rossi*, *op. cit.* 200, 341, *Tamid* 24.

³⁹*B. B.* 14-16. *San.* 93b. *Shabuoth* 35b. *Yad.* iii. 5 *Shabb.* 116a. *Psa.* 117a. *Shir. Hash. R.* iv. *Qohel. R.* vii.

Psalms, Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, &c., which they called Cabbalah, passed through the crucible of their criticism, the Pentateuch—the Torah *par excellence*—was not spared, and they maintained that Moses was inspired only in a general way and was left to work out the details as best he could.⁴⁰

Higher criticism was not held at that time as "higher anti-Semitism," but rather as higher, purer Judaism; and, in fact, it was not the Rationalists but the Traditionalists who, finding fault with many a book of Scriptures, suppressed much of our beautiful Wisdom literature, and sought to exclude those which, despite their efforts, found a way into the Canon.⁴¹ To the Rationalists these heirlooms of our past were valuable intrinsically, as well as for their suggestiveness. If they took exception to their anthropomorphisms, and by means of the thirty-two hermeneutic rules of R. Elezer b. Josi Hagglili endeavored to soften the harshness of legalism,⁴² they cherished all the relics of antiquity and would not part with the heritage of their fathers. In the course of time these books were no longer discriminated against, and even R. Aqiba asserted that Canticles—the book which caused the greatest opposition—was not only holy, but holy of holies, and that whoever regards it as a mere erotic poem causes evil to come upon the world.⁴³ The heterodoxy of yesterday is the orthodoxy of to-day!

It goes without saying that the Rationalists hesitated not to tear the veil from, and to give ethical valuation to, many a Biblical precept, notwithstanding the ban put against such mode of procedure by the rigid Traditionalists. The Bible, especially Deuteronomy, contains a number of "whys" and "wherefores." This was imitated by R. Simon b. Yohai, and this method R. Yhuda Hannasi indulged in with pleasure and profit.⁴⁴ They did search and find reasons and proved that the laws of God are not *gzeroth* and burdens

⁴⁰*Brak. Migl.* 16a., 31b. *Yalq. Shim* "Vayiq." §428; *Zohar* "Voethh." 261. *Tos. Ybam.* 16; *Zunz, op. cit.* 15 f. 46 n. b.; *Levinsohn, Pit. Hot.* 36 f. Warsaw. 1903.

⁴¹*Shabb.* 30b.

⁴²*Mkil.* "Yithra." *B. Q.* 83b. *San.* 15b. *Zunz, op. cit.* 90b.

⁴³*San.* 101a. *Yad* iii. 5., *Br. R.* xxvi. 7.

⁴⁴*R. H.* 29a., *San.* 21a., *B. R.* xvi. 4.

but a light to the feet of the wanderer in the path of life, and with Rab deplored the suppression of *Sefer Yohasin* "because it contained many explanations on the Biblical legislation."⁴⁵

The danger, however, that now threatened Israel was not Ecclesiasticism. With the dissolution of the nation and the destruction of the Temple the priestly institution had to give up its ghost, and Vespasian with one blow accomplished more than the generations of prophets and rabbis with their perfervid eloquence. The evil now lurked in a plethora of practice, and in an overwhelming scholar-worship. The *Talmid-Hakham* (learned) began to be vested with the privileges which were wrenched from the *Kohen* (Ecclesiastic). He was at liberty to take interest and not to pay taxes.⁴⁶ The Torah became all in all. "Turn it over and turn it over, for everything is in it, because for that purpose wast thou created, and the mere searching in it is worthy of recompense,"—these sayings of some⁴⁷ and the literal interpretation of the verse, "and therein shalt thou meditate day and night" (*Jos.* i. 8), now spurred on the Jews to become, if not, as Philo called them, "a nation of philosophers," at least as they finally were to be known through Mohammed, "a people of the book." As intimated above, many of the *gzeroth* were prompted by suspicion of the *Ame Haarez*. Hostility to the unlearned was carried to such a pitch that they were excluded not only from the association of the wise, but almost from the congregation of Israel; and were put on the same level with beasts and vermin.⁴⁸ It was the culmination of the Hebrew *Ecclesia*—ideal of a thousand years earlier and the harbinger of the Has-kalah movement a thousand and five hundred years later. As a consequence, everybody who could devoted himself to the pursuit of knowledge even to the detriment of his physical well-being, and would sell all he had to contract marriages with the aristocracy of learning. It was very much like a caste system, though the lines of demarkation were continually shifting.

Philo, clear-minded and broad of sympathy, was perhaps the first

⁴⁵*Psah.* 62b., *Dbar R.* vi. 1.

⁴⁶*P. Q.* 41b. 75a. *B. M.* 70-1. *Erak.* 28b., *Ndar.* 62b.

⁴⁷*Ab.* ii. 9. v. 27. *San.* 51b.

⁴⁸*Psa.* 49b., *Kthub.* 11a. *Ybam.* 62.

to point out that the uneducated men may arrive at the same conclusion by instinct as does the learned by intellect; and in a moment of introspection expressed his envy of the lot of his simple co-religionists who did not run the risk of skepticism by following the *ignis fatuus* of human reason. The same stand was taken by the Talmudists who freed themselves from the hampering ties of Traditionalism. Nay, they even surpassed him. The "favored few" idea, to which Maimoni, the philosopher, and de Leon, the mystic, gave utterance, still dominated the mind of Philo, and he still favored the initiated sect which was capable of receiving high esoteric doctrines. Esdras (II. xiv. 46-7) voiced the sentiment of his contemporaries when he suggested that the truth be delivered only "to such as be wise among thy people: for in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge." Not so the Rationalistic rabbis. The uneducated they treated indeed as merely grown-up children who may be unmoral but not immoral,⁴⁹ but they maintained that he who boasts "that he is concerned with nothing but the Law, is not concerned even with the Law;" he is like one who has no God. They asserted that it was not the quantity of study and prayer, but the quality that counted; that a short, whole-souled prayer is equivalent to "meditating in the Torah day and night;" and Raba advised to tell this to the *Ame Haarez*.⁵⁰ He who eats of the labor of his hands is greater than a Talmid Hakham, he is happy here and happy hereafter; the first question in the world to come will be "didst thou labor honestly?"⁵¹ As Habakkuk demanded only faith in God (ii.4), and Hillel only love of fellow-men, so did they require only denial of idolatry: for mankind could learn to be moral by observing nature as well as by learning Torah, the laws of which will cease to be operative at the advent of the Millennium.⁵²

This liberal tendency runs through the entire Talmudic encyclopedia, and manifests itself in a desire to level all distinctions be-

⁴⁹B. M. 33.

⁵⁰Ybam. 109b, Hag. i. . . Min. 99b, A. Z. 17a. Cf. Yore D. §7, 246 & Bacher, *op. cit.* 57 f.

⁵¹Shabb. 31, Brak. 8, Hul. 54b.

⁵²Hul. 5a. Migil. 13a. Erub. 100. San. 90. Ndar. 22b. Nida, 61b.

tween the sexes, between Jew and Gentile, between freemen and bondsmen. Woman was relieved from the obligations which depend on fixed occasion but enjoined to participate in whatever was not dependent on time; and she was entitled even to read the law in public.⁵³ The guide and rule of action was the convenience of and respect for the public; the aim was to avoid contention and more especially to obviate a possible "profanation of the Name."⁵⁴ They laid down the principles which permeated even Orthodox Judaism that danger is more imperative than dogma, and life than Law; that whenever it is possible (to observe a law), it is possible; whenever it is not, it is not; that as a rule, the "power of leniency is the best."⁵⁵ The Mishnah, even the Bible, must not be taken literally; the downfall of Jerusalem was caused by sacrificing the spirit to the letter; and they reiterated over and over again the old precept that no law should be framed which is onerous to the people.⁵⁶ They clearly would not countenance any of those *syagim* and *gzeroth* prompted by excessive regard for Jewish observances. Bricks must not be piled up so high that the wall become top-heavy and topple of its own weight. Too many things have already been prohibited to justify any additional ones. Sometimes even it is necessary to abolish in order to establish, to discard a law that the Law might remain.⁵⁷ Unless all the people declare to the contrary, things once permitted should be always permitted. For God is not a capricious God, does not exact too much from His people, and leaves to the good and great the privilege of instituting whatever they deem advisable for the benefit of the public.⁵⁸ They went even so far as to deprive any one who should court martyrdom of the honor of being quoted in the schools.⁵⁹

What they did inculcate on every occasion was the value of a good intention. Every act is estimated according to its kindliness;

⁵³Brak. 20b., *Mgil.* 22. *Qid.* 29.

⁵⁴Brak. 4b., 12b., 16a., 19b., 27b., 31a. *Yomah* 86a. *Git.* 45a, 48b; *Mgil.* 3, *Shabb.* 96, *Min.* 37, *Eruv.* 41.

⁵⁵*Hul.* 10a., 126b., *B. Q.* 28b., *Brak.* 60.

⁵⁶*B. Q.* 79b., *B. M.*, 30b., *B. B.* 60b., *A. Z.* 36a, *Hag* 10a, *Gitt.* 100.

⁵⁷*A. d. R. M.* i. 2. *J. Ndar.* ix. 1. *B. Ndu.* 40. *Min.* 99, *Tmur.* 14b, *Sanh.* 29.

⁵⁸*A. Z.* 3a. *Brak.* 63a. *B. Q.* 28b. *Shm. R.* xv. 24.

⁵⁹*B. Q.* 61a.

and they explained that the reason why R. Elazar regarded fasting and prayer as superior to charity was, because the one implies self-sacrifice, which is not necessarily implied by the other. A kindly and peaceful behavior absolves even from the sin of idolatry—the heinous sin which, like adultery and murder (but *not* “things strangled” as enumerated at the council of Jerusalem, 54 C. E., *Act.* xv. 29), is not to be committed even at the cost of life.⁶⁰ No heresy-hunting and sin-searching for them! They believed with the Deuteronomists that the “hidden things” belonged to God and if “before Him it is known, is it known to you?” When some rabbis sought to exclude Solomon from the category of the righteous, a Voice, they claimed, called out in the words of Job (xxx. iv. 33), “He will recompense him, whether thou choose, or whether thou refuse.”⁶¹ The numerous laws were to them not as so many traps to catch the unwary sinner, but rather as so many safety-valves, or so many beacon-lights, to save him. He who has done but one good deed has acquired a defender.⁶² Hence the maxim, that all Israelites have a portion in the world to come, which maxim they prefixed to the chapters of that most edifying and inspiring work, the *Pirque Aboth*,—the leniency toward a weaker brother as advocated by R. Yohanan bar Nafha; and the willingness to admit a convert on easy terms, as suggested by Hillel and maintained by R. Joshua b. Hanaya.⁶³ If the Bible discriminated against the Canaanites, and prohibited intermarriage with them, it was because of their idolatrous practices, of which the Gentiles “without the Land” are exempt; and even of the former the indictment was against their vices, by no means against their virtue (*Deut.* vii. 3).⁶⁴

Whoever utters a word, be he even an idolator, should be called rabbi, or *hakham*. For not creed but the deed is the main concern of Judaism; not priests, Levites, nor Israelites, but Gentiles as well.

⁶⁰*Suk.* 49b. *Sot.* 5b., *San.* 43b., 74a; *Brak.* 17a, 30a, 32b, 106b. *Yalq. Shim.* “Hoesa.” Cf. *Brak.* 34a.

⁶¹*Shabb.* 55, *San.* 104b.

⁶²*Ab.* iv. 2, *Sid.* 39; *San.* 111a.

⁶³*A. Z.* 26b. *Ybam.* 46a., *San.* 90a. Cf. Levinsohn, *B. Y.* ch. 61.

⁶⁴*Hulin* 13b. 60, *A. Z.* 36b. *Mid Mishle* xiv. 1, *San.* 39b. Cf. Holdheim, *Autonomie* etc. 115b. & *Das Rel. u. Pol. im. Jdtm.* 41 f. See *Tos. s. v.* “Dikht-hib.” Schwerin 1845.

It teaches that the pious ones among the nations of the earth have a portion in the world to come; and that whether man or woman, man-servant or maid-servant, Jew or Gentile, "he who doeth what is right shall reap his reward."⁶⁸

V.

I am aware that some will accuse me of prolixity, and that for a cursory sketch like mine I have perhaps amplified too much. But I have done so deliberately. The Talmud, on the one hand, has too often been maligned as the agent which has brought development in Judaism to an abrupt end; and, on the other, it has proved the arsenal from which most of the champions of Rational Judaism drew their weapons of attack and shields of defense. It may well be said that if the Talmud is like the sea, its ebb and flow are the Rational and Traditional waves of Judaism. It is in a sense the trunk from which sprouted the two branches which came to be known as Orthodoxy and Reform; it was at the same time effect and cause of the two never-absent tendencies in Judaism.

That in Persia, too, Traditionalism ultimately became triumphant, was not the fault of Judaism but of the changed status of the Jew. Not in vain did the upholders of the Old accept it as a principle that when "Israel waxeth fat he kicketh," and that "misery is as the becoming to Jews as a red trapping to a white steed."⁶⁹ Threatened with discord within and with attacks from without, writhing under the lash of cruel Caliths and tyrannical Exilarchs, the Jews again began to seek refuge in the performance of multitudinous rites and courage and comfort in the memory of the past.

Judaism became a Chinese wall which shut the Jews in and the Gentile world out. The "two colleges" of Sura and Pumbeditha lorded over the Diaspora with a scepter of iron. Rab's dread "lest the Torah be forgotten," his view that the *Mizvoth* were intended as a strict discipline, and his assertion that "whoever learns from an Amgushi deserves death," became endemic.⁷⁰ Traditionalism was

⁶⁸B. Q. 38a. *San.* 105a., *Br. R.* xxxvi. 9, *Yalq., Shim.* "Bres." xiv. 76.

⁶⁹*Hag.* 9; *Vay. R.* xiii. xxxv.

⁷⁰*Shabb.* 138b; *Jom.* 9b; *Vay R.* xiii. 3.

rampant. R. Meir's lenient decisions were refused acceptance; his name even was but seldom mentioned, because he admired and learned from one who discarded Tradition. R. Elazar was excommunicated because he sought a reason for washing the hands.⁵ And the Persian Jews would neither receive from others nor investigate their own treasure. As for the liberal teachings of Mar Samuel—he was “merely a *hakham*, not a *rabbi*!”⁶—a charge ever since laid at the doors of Jewish Reformers from Maimoni down to Geiger. How dear every tradition came to them can be judged from the naive question of a *rabbi* who wanted to know why Ben Mahallalel was not killed for advising his son, as his last will and testament, to follow the majority!⁷

That even then there were not lacking little electric sparks of liberalism to illumine the dense darkness, there are more evidences than one. While many were bowing their heads to the decision of the Gaonion, and accepted their dicta as binding as if they were those of Moses, there were others, among the Gaonim themselves, who, far, from countenancing the “foolish beliefs and superstitious practices” of the people, denounced them. Shrirā, Hai and Samuel b. Hafni, espoused the cause of reason in their interpretation of religion.⁸ It was in those times that the vowel-points were introduced into the Hebrew Bible, and, but for the objection of Mar Natrunai, would also have been introduced into the Scroll of the Law.⁹ Despite the injunction “not to change the stamp which the sages gave impressed upon the services, and not to go in the ways of the Ammarites,”¹⁰ the *Piutim*, imitations and adaptations of the secular songs and sacred litanies of the Gentiles, found their way into the synagogue, and those who later censured this usage were opposed to it not on the ground of its being an innovation, but because of the poor literary merit of the compositions. In the words of Ibn Ezra, they protested not against those which are as “fine as silk” but those

⁵*Of. Hag. 15a. & Erub. 13b Brakh. 19a., Ed. v. 6-7.*

⁶*B. M. 85-6.*

⁷*Shabb. 88a; Laz. op. cit. Ap. 13.*

⁸*Haeshkol i. 1, ii. 3; Yor. Deah, 116, Graetz, H. t., IV. 14n. 4.*

⁹*Kerem Hemed, iii. 200; Graetz, op. cit. H. T. III. Ap. 23b.*

¹⁰*J. Brakh. v. 9; vi. 10; Shabb. 67b.*

which are as "rough as sacks."⁹ A radical departure from Talmudic legislation were the *Taqqanoth* which started under the Saburites with according to woman the right to sue for divorce on the ground of incompatibility of temper,¹⁰ and culminated in the famous decisions of R. Gershom, "the light of the exile," in abolishing polygamy and instituting the law that no woman can be divorced against her will. These and similar innovations which are to be met with throughout the Middle Ages and throughout the Diaspora, indicate that the creative genius of Judaism, though cowed, was not conquered; and that the glowing embers of Rationalism were still hot under the heap of the cold ashes of formalism.¹¹

The place, however, where Medieval Judaism could expand and flourish congenially was in the land ruled by the cultured Arabs, where Jews enjoyed once more the civil and social equality of which they had a taste during their early sojournment in Egypt and Babylonia. There again, we find the preacher a dominant figure, and the collection of Agadoth a prominent feature. There again, the Rational genius of Judaism found vent and was given utterance by the most brilliant and enlightened leaders in Jewry. While freedom of action was frowned down, free-thought was still unhindered and unincumbered. The reason given in the Talmud for comparing Jews to a dove which when fatigued of one wing keeps aloft by clapping the other, may appropriately be applied to Israel of that day. When the current of progress was obstructed in one direction, it rushed with greater velocity in another. Traditionalism thrived only in the province of ceremonialism; the "hidden things" and the *dbarin shebballeb* were still out of its purview. Mendelssohn has declared, and Dr. Holdheim demonstrated, that ancient Judaism never said, "thou shalt, or shalt not, believe;" but, "thou shalt, or shalt not, do."¹² The mission-ideal, though subdued, was still manifest; and the Jewish sages set themselves the task to point out the moral values and eternal validities of pure Judaism, in the cer-

⁹See Dukes, *Relig. Poesie*, 9. Frankfort o. t. m. 1842; Harizi, *Tahkmoni*, 182. Warsaw, 1899; Zunz, *op. cit.* 43b. 492c; Ibn Ezra *Qohceleth*, v. i.

¹⁰*Shaare Zedeq* 56a; *Tos. Kthub.* 63b. Cf. *id.* 77b.

¹¹See Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, 45, 58-61. J. P. S. A.

¹²*Autonomie* xiii. f. *Jerusalem in Ges. Schrift.*, III. 321; Leipsic. 1847.

macular Arabic. They believed with the anonymous author of *Tana Dbe Elijah* that Israel takes precedence over the Torah, not the Torah over Israel. Hafni and Hai the Gaonim, and R. Hananeel b. Hushiel (1000-1060), the first critic of the Talmud, were Rationalists to a high degree. The philosophic speculations of Saadyah b. Joseph (892-942), the worthy successor to Philo, in the tenth century, and of Ibn Gabriol who, according to Geiger, was the forerunner of Spinoza, in the eleventh century, stirred up the dormant mind to renewed efforts; and the gentle and touching appeal of Bahya Haddayam to the "duties of the heart" emphasized again the old truth that it matters not "whether much or little if the heart be turned Heavenward."¹²

An outburst of unwonted enthusiasm evinced itself in the realm of Jewish science. The Bible furnished a fertile field for the rehabilitation of the spirit of Judaism. Saadyah translated the Scripture into Arabic, and, though certainly cognizant of the contention a Greek translation formerly caused in Judaism, and of the latter decision that the Bible may not be translated into any but the Greek tongue, nevertheless expected this labor of his to be an expiation for his sins. A bold Rationalism and independence of authority is the distinguishing characteristic of the eminent grammarians Hivi of Balk, the Ibn Kastars, Mnahen b. Saruq, Yhudah Hayyuj, Dunash b. Labrat and, especially, Jonah Ibn Janach, the critic of the Massorah and father of Hebrew syntax. Strange as it may seem, the critical skepticism with regard to Scriptures penetrated even into the stronghold of Traditionalism, France, and influenced even such a non-questioning Talmudist as R. Solomon Izhaqi. "Rashi," in his famous commentary, continually reminds us that though the *drasha* (exposition) may serve the purpose of pointing a moral or adorning a tale, it should not be relied upon in Biblical exegetics (*Gen.* iii. 8; *Neh.* i. 12; *Zach.* i. 8; *Psa.* lxxviii. 36). He suggests doubts about the traditional authorship of the Bible, nay, even of its plenary inspiration (*Num.* xvi. 31; *1 Chr.* i. 7; viii. 29; xii. 13).

¹²*Dbe Elijah* ix. xv. xx. xxv. *Tur. Y. D.* 116; Graetz, *op. cit.* Heb. tr. IV. 14n. 4. Saadyah (*Dan.* ix. 2, *Ezrah* vi. 15, from *Massef*, 138-9 St. Pet. 1902). Rab Hai calls some Talmudic statements. See *Tshub. Haggonim*. ed. Harkavy. Berlin, 1887, p. 197.

Even more interesting it is to find that his grandson, the "Rashbam," though an authority on *ṭfilin*, nevertheless accepted or agreed with the views held by Ibn Saruq concerning the interpretation of the verse on which the custom is based (*Ex.* xiii. 16) ; and ventured the opinion, so subversive of Tradition, that the Biblical day begins with the morning (*Gen.* i. 5). Against this view Ibn Ezra wrote his satire *Iggereth Hashshabbath*, and denounced him who held it as a rank infidel (*Ex.* xvi. 25). Yet he himself was certainly no Traditionalist. Though not the first, he was surely the most eminent higher critic of the Bible till the time of Spinoza, who took him as his model exegete. He combated, in his peculiar way, not only the Talmudists, both as regards their interpretations and inventions (*Gen.* xxiv. 1, xlv. 27 ; *Ex.* xxiii. 19 ; *Lev.* xxiii. 40), but suggested emendations in the Biblical text (*Ex.* xxv. 29), disputed the infallibility of Daniel, declared that Job was a translation (*Job* ii.), and was the first to call attention to (what is now accepted as incontrovertible) the composite authorship of the book of Isaiah." It is needless to say that the lucid and thoroughgoing grammarian, R. David Qamhi, never allowed his mind to be clouded by Traditionalism. "The words of the rabbis," he ever maintained (1 *Sam.* viii. 1 ; 1 *Chr.* xvi. 22 ; 2 *Chr.* viii. 16, 24 ; xiv. 17, 25), "can not outweigh reason ;" and like his great predecessors whom he outshone, he, too, took the liberty to correct the text (1 *Chr.* ii. 15), dispute the authorship, suggest the rearrangement, and deny certain alleged doctrines of Holy Writ (1 *Sam.* viii. 10 ; 1 *Kings* xvi. 28 ; 2 *Kings* viii. 16 ; 1 *Chr.* ii. 18). With one sweep he brushed aside the authority of those who were versed in the Talmud but not in the Bible, in his quaint doggerel :

"Who learned and mastered much of the Torah,
But the science of grammar doth not understand :
Is like one who ploweth and leadeth his oxen
With nor goad nor spur within his hand."

Of such a spiritual tree a mind like that of Moses Maimoni (1135-1204) would be the natural, if not inevitable, blossom. But

¹⁴Cf. *Ab. d. R. N.* xxxix. Spinoza, *Tract. Theol.-Pol.*, Eng. tr., ch. viii. London, 1862, & Qamhi, 1 *Sam.* viii. 1. Ibn Ezra. *Sifthe Hakhamim*, *Vayiqra*, ii. i.

his greatness consists in that he did not limit himself to any one phase of Judaism. His titanic intellect embraced every sphere of his religion, and he shed luster on whatever he touched. He bitterly inveighed against the authoritativeness of the Talmudists as proclaimed by the later rabbis, and disparaged many customs as recurrences of Sadducism. "Why," he exclaims, "why should their (the Talmudists') *gzeroth* be more binding than the statutes of the Torah which every Beth Din (ecclesiastic court) may invalidate? Should it even necessitate the abrogation of a positive, or the affirmation of a negative, commandment, we must conform to the requirements of the time. Even as a physician is in duty bound sometimes to amputate a hand or leg to save the rest of the body, so should the Beth Din sometimes *teach* to discard certain rites that the rest may remain; as the ancient sages expressed themselves, "Let one Sabbath be broken, that many Sabbaths may be kept." Again, "whether in matters which the modern rabbis know by tradition, or which appear necessary by them by Biblical and Talmudic interpretation, or things introduced by them because of the demands of the time, we are bound to accept their views, and whoever disregards them transgresses a law. Does it not say, "According to the Torah which *they* shall teach you"?¹⁵

Maimoni thus became the avowed exponent of a Judaism abreast of the time and acceptable to reason, and on his works the noblest thinkers fed for centuries. Reason to him was the court of last appeal, the only infallible guide in the *scheidung und sichtung* process to which he clung in his theological and philosophical treatises. Should Aristotle be right, he would not hesitate to interpret the Torah in keeping with Aristotle. In his *Yad Hahazaqah*, though faithful to Talmudic decisions, he glossed over or suppressed such laws as were distasteful to him, while in his *Moreh Nbukhim* he advocated those principles the maintenance of which would form a Jewish community of intelligent-pious ones (*Nbonim-hasidim*), to whom rational meditation, decorous behavior and hygienic observation would form an integral portion of their religion.¹⁶

¹⁵*Yad Hahaz.* "H. Mamrim," i. 2, ii. 4.

¹⁶*Y. H.* "Issure Biah" xi. 7. "Malveh Vloveh," iv., Mishna Qilaim, v.

Luzzatto, Graetz and several others have denounced Maimoni for the attempt to foist a creed upon Judaism.¹⁷ The truth is that this expedient was needful to save Jews to Judaism at a time when the observance of the ceremonies was fraught with untold dangers. The vehement and prolonged controversy which it aroused was caused, not by the Rationalists but by the Traditionalists, against his denial of authority in the *Yad*, his reasoning in the *Moreh*, and his arraignment of superstition in both.

Maimoni became the storm center of the conflict between Rationalism and Traditionalism, a conflict which continues to this day.

The battle was waged not only about doctrines and opinions but also about deeds and practices. Already in Canonic times we hear of numerous people who, like our modern Reformers, discarded religious ceremonies, changed the prayer-book, abolished the dietary laws and did not keep the second days of the festivals. The author of *Hagganah* speaks of those who maintained that the laws were intended only for Palestine, ridiculed the dialectics of the Talmud, and took a stand against the religious disabilities of woman.¹⁸ Until the arrival of R. Moses of Couci (c. 1240) we know that *tsilin* were not laid by the people at large; that evening services were not held; and that there were those who carried their indifference to the extent of disassociating themselves from their conservative co-religionists.¹⁹

There were also many who were alienated from the synagogue,²⁰ and then as now each party laid the blame of the religious disinte-

Hannzcken. "H. Deoth," iv, II. "Qid. Hahod." xxvii. 25. *Mor. Nebuk* ii, 25 (*creatio ex nihilo*), 30, 47, iii. 3, and those who believe otherwise he calls.

¹⁷Com. to *Mishn. San.* x. (90a) : xi. (resurrection) ; cf. *Naz.* v. 5 & "Tosaf. Yomtov" *ad.* 10c.

¹⁸*Hagganah* 15d, 16d. 22bd, 26a, 49b, 66b, 71b, 124d; Saadyah, *Em. Vd.* 39b, 40a. *Shaare Zedeg*, 24n. 10. Abarbanel, *Yshuath Mshihe* 15b. *Qreskas*, *Or. Ad.* Intr. Shem Tob, *Kbod Elohim* 28b., Levinsohn *B. Yh.* 1. 92n; Geiger, *op. cit.* 400.

¹⁹See Harizi, *op. cit.* 7, 18, 19, 472-3; Bernfeld, *Dor. Tahapukhoth.* 30.

²⁰How unfounded is the charge of the quasi Orthodox of to-day who identify Reformation with 'assimilation' can be proven not only from the Talmudic laws regarding converts, which must have arisen from the demands of the day, but from the entire history of Judaism. If Ibn Ezra's son became a Mohammedan, and Levita's grandson converted himself to

gration at the door of the other. Not only R. Solomon of Montpellier, in France, R. Moses Taku of Germany, and the "Rosh" of Spain, even R. Moses Nahmoni and R. Solomon b. Adret pronounced the Rambam, Ibn Ezra, and Saadyah as heretics and trouble-makers of Israel, assigned their writings to the flames and condemned those who read them as infidels. Even the grave of "Rabbenu" Moses suffered desecration at the hands of his fanatic opponents.²¹ But the Rationalists, though inferior in numbers, held their ground, and the onslaughts of the Traditionalists only emboldened them in their progressive aspirations.

They protested their innocence of the charges of assimilation; and they claimed, on the contrary, that they aimed to build up Judaism by extirpating the parasites which festered upon its body and sapped its life-blood. Among the leaders of these Rationalists were such men as R. David Qanhi (1160?-1235?), the eminent grammarian; R. Jacob b. Mahir Ibn Tibbon, the translator, and R. Jacob Anatoli, the renowned preacher, whose fiery eloquence won recruits from the ranks of the Orthodox. Through their instrumentality, and chiefly owing to the indefatigable labor of the Tibbonites—the illustrious family which for several centuries kept the light of reason from being extinguished—the first concerted action in behalf of Reform was taken in Israel. The meeting convoked at Montpellier with its sentence of excommunication against those who should malign the name of R. Moses b. Manimon; who should oppose the unrestricted study of science and philosophy, no matter in what language they were treated; or who should condemn an author for heresy on account of his philosophical opinions, may well be regarded as the *first Central Conference of Reformed Rabbis in the Diaspora*.²²

Catholicism, so did the sons of many more conservative parents and teachers, e. g., Abnor Alphonso and Pfefferkorn, down to Carl Huton and Prof. Choalson. How strong Orthodoxy proved to hold the attention of those within the fold can be learned from the numerous references to indifference to religion, ignorance of the law, and disregard of morality which existed in some of the most conservative communities even during the heyday of Orthodoxy. R. Tam (Sefer Hayushar iii). At the same time even men like R. Mnahen (Zedah Laderech I 37 or 44b. & Zunz 494) decried the lack of decorum in the synagogue.

The battle since then became a battle of pamphlets; and in the warfare, then as now, the Rationalists had little difficulty in worsting the Traditionalists. Among the great wielders of the quill was R. Ydayah Bedarsi, whose letter to Ben Adret is one of the gems of the literature of Reform Judaism.

"We can not give up science," he insists; "it is as the breath of our nostrils. Even if Joshua should appear and forbid it, we could not obey him; for we have a warranty, who outweighs you all—Maimoni, who has recommended it and impressed it upon us. We are ready to set our goods, our children, our very lives at the stake for it."²² A more profound Rationalist, R. Levi b. Gershon, of France—which offered for a while a place of refuge for Reform—was even more outspoken in his commentary to the Torah, the "Battles of the Lord" (which the Traditionalists parodied into the "Battles on the Lord"). In the introduction thereto he censured those who "avoid whatever is based upon investigation, and philosophic postulates, and is not transmitted from others." He was fearless to the extreme. "Should our research," he declares, "lead us to contradict a statement in the Torah, we would not, because of the Torah, falter to tell the truth . . . the Torah is not a code which enjoins us to believe what is not so; its main object is to direct us, as much as possible, on the path that leads to truth."

These vindicators of truth and science found a responsive note in the heart of many of the brethren. Saadyah, Ibn Ezra, Maimoni himself, were studied, imitated, and commented upon. Talmudists like "Meiri" and "Kaspi" ventured to blaze out a new trail for themselves in the explanation of the Bible and codification of the Halakha; while the philosophers, like Joseph Albo in Spain and Elijah Selmedigo in Italy, continued the Rationalistic movement in the realms of theology. Albo was the last but not least of the Arabic Jewish school of Rationalists. To him also the numerous laws were so many avenues of escape, and with the Talmud he believed he who doeth one commandment is certain of his reward. But more than the Rambam he held that innovations in Judaism are permissible, not only as temporary measures, but for all time

²²*Minhath Qanooth*, Nos. 54, 76.

²³*Tshuboth Rashba*, 418 as rendered in English in Graetz, *op. cit.* IV. 44.

even as Ezra changed permanently the first month into the seventh because he wished to commemorate the new redemption rather than the old; and, differing from the Rambam, he declared that the basic principles in Judaism are only three, to which if any one, after mature deliberation, finds himself unable to subscribe, "he sins unknowingly . . . and is still to be reckoned among the wise and pious ones of Israel." He proved this from the Talmud where R. Hillel (and others) disclaimed any belief in a Messiah and were regarded as good and great and faithful Jews.²⁴

Time, too, helped not a little in healing the breach, and Traditionism which, in keeping with its principle, sees a halo of glory around the great ones of the past, gradually grew to cherish the memory of the very men who were formerly denounced as traitors to Israel's cause.

"The past will always win
A glory from its being far;
And orb into the perfect star
We saw not when we moved therein."

Thus Joseph Karo (1488-1515), the pious author of the *Shulhan Arukh*, included Maimoni among the three authorities (Alfasi and Asheri!) on whose decision he relied. But circumstances were not auspicious for the spread of enlightenment among Jews of Medieval times. The massacres and expulsions which ravaged the Jewish communities of France, Germany and latterly of Spain, "the Paradise of the Jews," gave a stunning blow to research, and the Jewish intellect concentrated itself in the "four ells of the Halakhah," or sought safety in the fancy flights of the Qabbalah. Judaism became a prey to what Origen would call, "the foolishness of beggarly minds." The chief concern of the rabbis lay in accumulating *Minhagim* (customs), and ascribing to them supernatural virtues. Qabbalah was preached from the pulpits, and penetrated even into the prayer-book.²⁵ The very teachings of the Rationalists were enforced in the service of mysticism, and not only were such works as *Hekhaloth*, *Habbahir* and *Zohar* attributed, respectively, to R. Ishmael,

²⁴*Iqarim* i. 14 18-21, iii. 14-18, 29, iv. 42.

²⁵*Tshub. Rashba*. 414, Chagez, *Mishnath Hakhamim* §589.

R. Nhunyah and R. Simon b. Yohi, the zealous Qabbalists entrenched themselves even behind such names as Saadyah, Hai, Ibn Ezra and Maimoni! Modifying the words of Bar-Qapparah, at the death of R. Yhudah Bannasi, we may say of Judaism toward the end of the Middle Ages: "Angels and mortals have contended for the Holy Ark, the mortals have conquered and the Holy Ark is captured."

VI.

Gestoert, aber nicht zerstoert, this winged word of Dr. Zunz, how true it is of Judaism in general and the Reform movement in Judaism in particular! When Medieval darkness spread over Jews and Judaism in France and Germany, behold the sun of enlightenment dawn in Italy! The material welfare, and comparatively favorable status of the Jews there called for a readjustment of religion with life; and the rigorisms of the rabbis became burdens unendurable.

There, the movement set a-going by the Tibbonites found numerous adherents after it began to decline in Spain and the Provence. Elijah Delmedigo, while he offered his meed of respect to the rabbis who at all times "were the leaders of our people and its judges," disputed their authority to bind for all time to come.¹ There was R. Jacob Anatolio, the preacher, who settled in Naples, and R. Hillel, of Verona, the philosopher; and thither King Robert invited the erudite Kalonynos b. Kalonynos. Literature began to flourish almost as it did in the golden days of Spain. The works of Leo Romano, Judah Siciliano and Emmanuel Romi improved the taste and enhanced the appetite for culture. Rationalism made such rapid progress that already R. Zrahyah b. Shaltiel regarded Hillel of Verona as too conservative, and intimated to him to go "back to his native land, put on his *tallith* and *tfilin* and regale himself with the delectable *Sefer Yzirah*."²

And again, the study of the Bible came to the front and the mission-ideal took hold of the leaders of Italian Jewry. Elijah Levita (1472-1549), the grammarian, who shattered the tradition with respect to the antiquity of the vowel-points, also set an example of

¹*Bhinath Haddath*, ed. Reggio 27, 53-8, 71. Vienna, 1873.

²*Ozar Nehmad* ii. 124, 142.

closer intimacy with Gentiles, and proved that it not only does not de-Judaize, it even helps remove prejudice and calumny. The rise of the Christian Reformation, too, inspired the Jews with the hope of seeing their cherished dream come true through the medium of the holy tongue. "Such," says Levita, "is the fruit of our language when it becomes known among the Gentiles. Therein lieth our salvation."³ And the fact is undeniable that his influence on Reuchlin, Aegidio, Fagius, Muenster and others contributed not a little to moulding the Christian Reformation.⁴ In rabbinics, Azariah dei Rossi (1511-1578), at the same time that Joseph Karo wrote his code in which he embodied much of the dross that accrued to Judaism through the ages, and Ibn Yachya produced his history which contains a medley of fact and fable—submitted everything to a searching examination, and his *Mor Onayim* proved indeed a light to the eyes of the seekers after truth. "If we moderns," he remonstrated, "are like pigmies, then are we like pigmies who ride upon giants, and can see more than the giants. . . If as regards prophecy the ancients were superior, we of to-day surpass them in matters pertaining to research and investigation. . . If they dug, we, by their help, have succeeded in securing the water for which they dug."⁵ Dissatisfied with the Traditional data based on the Talmud, he called to his assistance not only the forgotten Jewish philosopher Philo, but even the Church Fathers; and his spirit of inquiry led him on to point out the many inconsistencies which had crept into both the Talmuds and the Bible.⁶

For Reform rabbis, the life and labor of Leon da Modena (1571-1648) has a peculiar attraction. That many of his biographers, among them Graetz, have condemned him as a heretic and sycophant, should not surprise us when we recall that these epithets were shared by him in common with Dei Rossi, Levita and even Maimoni, Ibn Ezra and Saadyah, and, for all we know, with Mar Samuel, R. Yhudah and Hillel Hannasi. The student of religious Reformation hardly needs to be reminded that Luzzatto exaggerated

³*Msorath Hammassorah* intr.

⁴See L. Geiger, *Das Stud. d. heb. Sprache*, 55 f. Breslan 1870.

⁵*Mor Onayim*, ch. xiv.

⁶*Tb.* Chaps. v. ix. xi. xx.

when he referred to him as "a hater of the sages of the Talmud and Mishnah more than the Qaraites, and a more rabid Reformer than Geiger."⁷ Yet, to use a Qabbalistic term, his soul was a *nizuz* (spark) of the same fire which later kindled the soul of Geiger. He was indeed a connecting link between Geiger and Maimoni. In separate brochures, as well as in his commentary on *En Yaaqob*, he inflicted telling blows on mummified Orthodoxy; and in eloquent language he pleaded for Reform from the pulpit. He introduced choral services into the synagogue, and a systematic schedule into the school. More than this, he endeavored to restore Judaism to its pristine purity. Taking up the code of Asheri as an example, he points out how Judaism was weakened by its excrescences; and asks whether it were not reasonable to presume that had the Torah intended that these laws be binding it would have stated so unequivocally?⁸ This he repeats in various places in *Qol Sakhal* and *Habbonah*; and suggests the abolition of many rites, the relaxation of the rigorisms of the Sabbath and festivals, and the shortening of services. "If the sages of the Talmud," says he, "allowed one on a journey, to abbreviate his devotion because of his being busy and worried, so much the more reason is it adequate that we prolong not our prayers when we are worried by the *galuth* and about the means of earning a livelihood."⁹ He advocates also the acceptance of proselytes on easy terms, and especially of a more cordial relation between Jew and Gentile. In brief, he asks for the removal of any obstacles which hinders Judaism from realizing its ancient mission and become a "light to the nations."¹⁰

Needless to say, he had little in common with the mystics. He was indeed the first to call attention to the spuriousness of the *Zohar*, and condemned the belief in witchcraft and the transmigration of the soul, which at that time found a defender in no less a personage than Manasseh b. Israel.¹¹

⁷*Iggaroth Shdal*, No. 980 (May 25, 1846).

⁸*Qol Sakhal*, 21, 22, 28, 30, 52-5.

⁹*Brakh.* 29.

¹⁰*Shabb.* 9b. 137. *Ybam.* 47, *Hag.* 22; see Libovitz, R. Y. A. Modena, 56-9, Vienna, 1896; Geiger in *Ozar Nehmad* i, 130-1; Bernfeld, *Kaempfer. Geister in Jdtm.* 21-2. Berlin, 1907.

¹¹*Cf. Nishmath Havim*, I. viii., III. IV. i. xxi, *passim*.

The advocates of Rationalism, however, were yet merely "one in a city and two in a tribe." They lacked the dynamic power which comes from concerted action. The many conversions which through the Middle Ages, from Ibn Ezra to Levita, harassed the camp of Israel, contributed to the ascendancy of Orthodoxy and the crushing of Reform. There are indeed several modern scholars among them, also Geiger and Graetz, who see even in Qabbalah, and Pilpul, and Shulhan-Arukh itself the symptoms of the independence of the spirit of Judaism and its impatience under the control of authority; and R. Chernowitch of Odessa has built upon this theory a most ingenious system of historical prospective. Moses Isserles' Annotations were prompted, in reality, by the desire to show that the *Shulhan Arukh* was not yet "the table before the Lord," and to protest against R. Joseph's slavishness to the codes of Alfasi, Maimoni and Asheri and the mysticism of the Zohar. Nor did Judaism even then surrender to the Karo-Isserles code unconditionally and without a struggle, as various remarks in response and commentary by such lights as R. R. Mintz, Jaffe, Bachrach and others of similar standing sufficiently attest.¹² But by far the greatest bulk of the Jewish literary output down to the end of the eighteenth century consists of responses and commentaries on commentaries, "a command to a command, a line to a line." The chief interest was no longer *Emunoth Vdeoth* but *Sheeloth Utshuboth*, and the controversies remind us of the homoousian-homoiousian controversy in Christendom. *Wir debatiren, ob wir Stiefel putzen oder schmieren!*

VII.

Yet the seed which the enlightened leaders of Israel have scattered was destined to burgeon forth and produce flowers and fruit as soon as the icy layer of prejudice and persecution began to melt. The eighteenth century proved to be the climactic period, and Germany the promised land for a rejuvenated Israel. The admission of Jews into the universities, and the pursuit by them of secular studies, was gradually undermining the fabric of Traditionalism;

¹²See *Hashshiloah* IV. & VIII.; Graetz, *op. cit.* Heb. tr., VIII. 460 f. & my *Sect. Creed and Custom*, 115f.

and Germany, which had been wrapped in darkness when the light shone in Spain, Provence and Italy, was the first to proclaim the advent of a new day. This "revolution under the form of a law" may be said, for convenience's sake, to have commenced with Mendelssohn's specimen of his translation of the Bible into German (*Alim Littrufah*, Amst. 1778), which affected Judaism even more than the first translation of the Bible into Greek, and produced the maxim that all Reformation begins with a Biblical translation. Mendelssohn himself, however, can at best be regarded only as the advance agent, or rather, the unconscious instrument, of the Jewish Reformation. Wessely in his *Dibre Shalom Veemoth* (1782) was a more avowed advocate of Reform than Mendelssohn in his *Jerusalem*, in which, though he denies that Judaism is a religion with a creed, and recognizes that "there are no eternal verities which the human intellect can conceive but it has also the power to create," he yet insists that the ceremonial laws are binding forever.¹ It was these ceremonials that proved the most burdensome, because they militated the most against the spirit of the time; and the "Rambam" with his emphasis on creed would have been more timely than "Rambman" with his stress on deed.²

For the problem now became, not how to reconcile faith with philosophy, but the *Law* with *Life*. To use the current phraseology of the day, the *Aufklaererei* and *Bildung* produced a Kulturkampf in which the target was practice even more than precept. In this conflict between the Old and New, the *Massfim* (1784-1811) took no mean part. They were the outcome indeed of the first concentrated action on behalf of Reform Judaism; constituted, if I may say so, the first Jewish Reform Congregation; and met with further-reaching results than the concrete form first given it in the Consistory of Israel Jacobson two years before the birth of Abraham Geiger (May 24, 1810). To them flocked all the idealists who broke loose from the gyves of Traditionalism; from their pages, as from so many pulpits, they preached the principles of a renovated Judaism; and in hundreds of cities enthusiastic readers were drinking in their words and joining the ranks. The tendency became a

¹*Op. cit.* 311f. 351f.

²See Zunz. *op. cit.* 46z f. & Bernfeld *Daath Elohim* 578 f. Warsaw 1899.

movement which, like an avalanche, was rolling and growing as it rolled. Beginning with Mendelssohn's advocacy of the permissibility of such thing as vaccination, or the postponement of a funeral,³ and the plea for a pure German, it eventually culminated in the æsthetization of Jewish worship, the renunciation of obsolete rites, the substitution of German for Hebrew in the services, the introduction of the sermon in the vernacular, and the admission of woman to all the duties and privileges enjoyed by man.

As the language employed by the *Massfim*, in fact by most of the early Reformers, was the international Hebrew, their audience was not limited to Germany, but was disseminated far and wide over distant Russia and darkest Galicia. Reform, towards the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, seems to have been "in the air." Like Wessely, the Gaon of Vilna mapped out a new curriculum for the schools, which revolutionized the prevailing outworn system of education, and urged the acquisition of secular sciences, "since by so much as one is ignorant of the other sciences, so much, by an hundredfold, is he ignorant of the science of the Torah."⁴ The steady influx of Russian "Maskilim" to Germany, and their personal contact with the "divine philosopher," aided also by the *Siur* commentary, caused not a few of their countrymen to wake up from their lethargy and inaugurate various Reforms. Dubo the Massorite, Maimon the philosopher, Schick the scientist, Dr. Hurwitz, Satanow, Ilye and Levin the literateurs, and a host of others, were like so many hands reaching out for the light which flooded from Germany but was by an ill fate excluded from their own land.

In Galicia, too, R. Solomon L. Rappaport reintroduced the critical study of the Talmud, and Nahman Krochmal, resuming the thread of the mission ideal, as formerly developed by Saadyah and latterly perfected by Geiger, pointed out in his profound but incomplete *Moreh Nbukhe Hazzman*, that the kernel of Judaism consists in its striving for absolute spirituality, and that the greatest progress made by the Jews was when they divested themselves of the

³*Massef*, Sep. 1785 (*Bik. Hait.* 1822, pp. 23 f. 82 f.).

⁴*Path Hashshulhan*, int.; Plungian, *Ben Porath*, 33 Vilva 1858.

fetters of nationalism, on the one hand, and formalism, on the other,⁵—the platform of advanced Reform Judaism in a nutshell.

These exponents of Reform, however, were still as much the slaves of authority almost as their fanatic opponents. The appeal was still made to the Talmud and rabbinic literature. With them it was only a change of masters, a preference for R. So-ben-so to R. So-ben-so. Geiger, the "new Hillel," was the first to announce that the connection with the past means, not a subservience to the past authority of any kind, but "the persistence of the living idea which permeates all ages with its vigor;" and "that Reform means for us, changed, new appearance; a rejuvenated life, forms permeated and saturated with the spirit. The difficult and the easy, the whole and the part, are to receive meaning and significance, to uplift the spirit, to kindle the heart, in order that religion may influence the entire view and course of life."⁶

But here I must stop, if I do not desire to transgress the admonition of our ancient sages that "no kingdom may trespass upon its neighbor even the breadth of a hair," or to disregard the boundary set for me by you. I hope, however, that from what has been said you will see that Reform in Judaism is not a parasitic growth nor a new graft on the ancient tree; that it, too, has its holy ground, its priceless treasures and glorious associations; that in different phases and various guises, it has appeared, reappeared and appeared again, during the ages prior to Geiger—the "thus far and no further" of my task; and that like the land of Judea according to the Talmud,⁷ so does the religion of the Jews possess a remarkable elastic property, and while it shrank and shriveled in one place "expansions and enlargements," real and substantial, ever arose to it from another place.

⁵*Morch Nbu. Haz.* viii. ix. Cf. Bernfeld, *D. E.* 588 & See M. Raisin, *Year Book C. C. A. R.* XVI., 273-90.

⁶Quoted by Philipson, *op. cit.* 16, 60. See Geiger, *op. cit.* 162-3. Cf. Saadyah, and L. Geiger, *Abraham Geiger*, 331. Berlin, 1910.

⁷*Gittin*, 57a. See my *S., C. & C.*, 132.

E

ABRAHAM GEIGER AS REFORMER.

BY RABBI DAVID PHILLIPSON, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.

The closing quarter of the eighteenth century is designated by historians the birth period of the modern age. Yet that which we are pleased to term modernity was not a sudden birth. The break up of mediævalism was gradual. Many forces were at work in the process. The results of the working of these forces took visible form in the emancipation movements which ushered in the modern age. These emancipation movements received their baptism of fire in the American and French Revolutions whose watchword was the "rights of man," as opposed to the feudal motto of the special privileges of the favored classes. Their first aim naturally was to remove most glaring wrongs which had grown up during the centuries of oppression. No section of the European population had been oppressed more grievously than the Jews. In those days of enthusiasm for liberty they too found warm-hearted advocates who pleaded for them. Mirabeau in France and Dohm in Germany championed the cause of Jewish emancipation. When in September, 1791, the French Assembly accorded the Jews of France the rights of citizenship the curtain rose on the unfoldment of the drama of the liberation of the Jew from the civil disabilities which persecution had forged, the end of which after an action of one hundred and twenty years is not yet. This was however not the only phase of emancipation apparent in the experience of Jewry. This outer change was accompanied

by a no less startling change in their inner life. The inner change was due to what may be called their linguistic and educational emancipation, both of which were essential ingredients in the complex fabric of that wonderful time. The linguistic emancipation of the Jews received its impetus from Moses Mendelssohn, whose translation of the Pentateuch into pure German was the textbook through which his co-religionists acquired the knowledge of the German language which displaced the jargon, the sign of the Jew's degradation, the mongrel speech, part German, part Hebrew, with sprinklings from other European tongues, a corrupt linguistic hodge podge, the language of the ghetto. The knowledge of the German language made possible the educational and intellectual emancipation of the German Jews. Though education and intellectual activity had always been prized among Jews still the effect of the confinement in the ghetto during the centuries of oppression had become apparent in the narrowing of the educational field. The Jewish boy, educated in the *cheder* and the *yeshibah*, received instruction in Hebrew branches only. The Talmud and the casuists furnished the intellectual food for the most gifted. So-called secular learning had become a veritable *terra incognita* for the inhabitants of the ghettos of Germany in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The founding of modern schools for Jewish boys and youths beginning with the Jewish Free School in Berlin in 1778 made possible the acquisition of secular education by the pupils of these schools, numbers of whom entered later the gymnasias and the universities.

A direct result of the civil emancipation from without and the linguistic and educational emancipation from within was the religious emancipation commonly known as the reform movement. The outlook of the men, who freed from the restrictions of centuries, mingled in the life of the world and were carried along by the thought currents of that remarkable time, was altogether different from that of their ancestors, the inhabitants of the ghetto. The expression and form which the Jewish religion had assumed, however satisfactory to those ancestors ceased to make a living appeal to thousands of the new generation. The strict observance of the many ceremonies codified in the *Shulchan Aruk* had become for

many the be all and the end all of Judaism. Piety was measured by this conformity in practice. The living spirit of the religion was well nigh smothered by the many layers of form and ceremony in which it was enwrapped. The public service had become a tiresome, meaningless, disorderly exercise. The stirring word of religious exhortation was not heard in the synagogue; the preacher's voice had been practically silenced; the rabbi as far as his practical service went, was sought merely for the interpretation and decisions of rabbinic juridical legislation. Religious reform was an absolute necessity if the generation emancipated from the ghetto was not to drift further and further away from the moorings of the ancestral faith. A re-interpretation of the message of Judaism and a re-adjustment of its external expression were imperative in the light of the changed experiences in the fortunes of Jewry. Thus was the reform movement the logical accompaniment of the emancipation of the Jews. It was the religious counterpart of the new freedom that marked the removal of the ghetto conditions. The passing of the Jews from the ghetto, the symbol of mediævalism, into the larger life of the world was as critical an episode in their history as was the deliverance from Egypt with the consequent entrance into Palestine and as was the loss of Palestine with its accompanying dispersion to the four corners of the earth. Each crisis had to be met in the light of conditions and circumstances. Each crisis demanded an adjustment to the changes in the people's life. The reform movement is the expression of this adjustment in the modern world.¹

The early history of the reform movement is mainly the story of the attempt to aestheticize the public service. This story centers about the name and work of Israel Jacobson. Although Jacobson deserves all credit for his efforts to introduce such features into the service as would make it attractive to his generation, yet he was altogether inadequate to the task of leading in the real work

¹One of the appalling accompaniments of the acquisition of occidental culture by the Jews at the beginning of the modern age was the wholesale conversion to Christianity. The reform movement checked this by offering an interpretation of Judaism that was in accord with the new outlook of the emancipated Jew. See Geiger *Nachgelassene Schriften* V. 103.

of religious reform. His was not the power to penetrate into the true significance of the great change which had come into the life of the Jews. He had not the philosophical insight to demonstrate that the new religious movement was the necessary outcome of historical conditions and was as truly in the line of Jewish development as was the rabbinism of the preceding centuries. But despite all this, his fame is secure for by instituting the first reform service in July, 1810, with prayers and sermon in the vernacular and with organ and choir he demonstrated that his was the spirit of the pioneer. Subsequent incidents in the activity of the German reformers of the second and third decades of the nineteenth century followed the path blazed by Jacobson. The reforms instituted in Berlin and Hamburg² aimed mainly at producing a public service of an orderly and decorous character. It remained for a later generation of reformers headed by Abraham Geiger to set forth the true significance of the reform movement and to establish it on the sound basis of historical research and logical development.

Abraham Geiger, who combined to a degree as did few others of his generation the mastery of Jewish lore with secular learning, was peculiarly fitted to become the leader of that movement in Judaism which applying the touchstone of development to the traditions of the past was to interpret the eternal message of Judaism in a manner consonant with the spirit of modernity. His was primarily the historical temper. By a thorough study of the past he became convinced that there had always been a developing force in Judaism; this may have been in abeyance at times but to him there could be no doubt that Judaism spelt development and that Judaism's history and literature if studied and correctly grasped yielded irrefutable proofs of the truth of this statement. He felt that a time had come in the life of the Jewish people when a new interpretation of the eternal values of Judaism was imperative but he would have this interpretation evolutionary and revolutionary.³ The tree of Judaism rooted in the far past still had life force sufficient to send forth new branches. The movement for reform as he

²Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, p. 31. New York, 1907.

³Wenn auf irgend einen Gebiete so ist nämlich auf dem religiösen das

conceived it was not to be a break with the past.⁴ From the very moment that he entered upon the active practice of the rabbinical profession in Wiesbaden he committed himself without reserve to the advocacy of the reform movement.⁵ In a letter written in 1836 to his friend, M. A. Stern, the celebrated mathematician, he declared that "not emancipation but reform was the leading issue of the day for the Jews."⁶ He never faltered in this faith; he wanted a living Judaism, not a religion that was a mere survival of a vanished past. In a hundred and one forms he expressed himself to this effect; "we want bread for our hunger," he wrote passionately, "water for our thirst; the spirit ought to receive fresh powerful nourishment and we are being trifled with and flowers are given us and that too of doubtful fragrance; we want a faith that satisfies the spirit and inspires us to accomplish deeds for the present day and they rear us to be men who dream only of the past; we want a love that bears fruit and they feed us on effeminate piety and weak, heartless sentimentality. An interest in the past arises only from a living present; if Judaism were to manifest itself as a living force in us, we would know that this force must have been creative at all times and we would notice attentively the results of this creative force."⁷ Ever and all the time this is the burden of his thought. Reform is a link in the chain of Judaism's development;⁸ it is vain to retain such institutions and doctrines as are moribund, "whatever the spirit of history in which God reveals himself, has removed and buried no human skill can resuscitate and revivify."⁹ This is one of Geiger's most illuminating thoughts; God reveals himself constantly in the course of history; if men have ears to hear and eyes to see, they will grasp the constantly appear-

Verfahren der Reform allein segensbringend, die Revolution nur geeignet, allen Lebenskräften ein gefährliches Siechthum beizubringen. *Nachgelassene Schriften* I. 205. See also *Ibid.* V. 196, 202, and *J. Z. W. L.* VI., 4.

⁵*Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, V., 251.

⁶Letter to Salomon Geiger of date April 19, 1833, *Nachgelassene Schriften* V. 80.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁸*Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, VII. (1846) 7.

⁹*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 147. *Ibid.*, I. 204.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, V. 190.

ing revelation; past, present and future are indissolubly connected; we must gain knowledge and insight from the experiences of past generations but we must live in the present and toil intelligently for the future.¹⁰ Fealty to Judaism does not demand a blind adherence to the past without regard to the requirements of the living present. True there is a spirit of Jewish tradition which the ages have been producing; this spirit of tradition has expressed itself in thousands of separate traditions which we term customs, ceremonies and forms; these separate traditions arise and pass; the developing spirit brings forth many different traditions in varied ages and places. To cling to past traditions merely because at some time or other the spirit of Judaism has produced them, is to indulge in a hazy romanticism which prefers the dim light of the vanished past to the bright day of the glowing present.

Geiger had no patience with this romantic attitude. He visited it with all the scorn at his command. He felt that it was an undue exaltation of the past at the expense of the present and that it gave evidence of an unhealthy state of mind.¹¹ His was a peculiarly sane temperament. He was not a blind worshipper of the past, neither was he a ruthless iconoclast. He was neither reactionary nor radical, neither romanticist nor ultra-modernist. He was in the best sense of the word a reformer who felt that the present can continue all that is fine and worthy in the past by presenting the everlasting truth of Judaism in a form which attracts the contemporary generation. In a dissertation on the reform of the ritual he set this forth very clearly, "Every reform," he wrote, "is a transition from the past into a regenerated future; such reform does not break with the past but rather preserves carefully the bond that connects the present with the past; it not only continues the once living spirit in new vital forms, thereby strengthening this spirit anew, but it retains all the charming attachment to that which has grown precious and dear in the religious life.

¹⁰"Aus der Vergangenheit schöpfen, in der Gegenwart leben, für die Zukunft wirken;" motto accompanying Geiger's picture 1857, *Nachgelassene Schriften* V. 279.

¹¹*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 88. *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, VI., 20.

Such reform proceeds not with inexorable logic, it follows the law of historical development."¹² In his view reform was simply the latest stage in the process of Jewish development. He differed radically with the traditionalists who claimed that every expression in the Talmud and the codes was authoritative; he would not concede that the possibilities of Judaism had become exhausted with the work of the Talmudical doctors; all ages present and to come had their contribution to make to the religion no less than the ages agone. If the traditionalists were right in their position that all tradition was in the Talmud, then in all the centuries that have elapsed since the close of the Talmud Judaism has been only a lingering survival and has been merely feeding on the products of a vanished past. Inasmuch as they looked upon Judaism as having slept during all this time they have no right to speak of a tradition three thousand years old. But whatever the traditionalists may claim there could be no doubt of the fact that in the conflicts and tendencies of the modern age the spirit of Judaism was re-asserting itself in a new way and God was revealing himself in a new manner.¹³

Through the expression of such views Geiger and his sympathizers naturally aroused the bitter antagonism of the rabbis of the old school and their followers. For these Judaism was a closed chapter. The teachings and observances of the religion as codified in the *Schulchan Aruk* were to be accepted and carried out without question. The reformers on the other hand contended for the freedom of research and investigation into each and any religious institution or tradition. This antagonism reached an acute stage when Geiger was elected rabbi of the Breslau congregation. Solomon Tiktin who had been rabbi of the congregation for many years refused to

¹²*Unser Gottesdienst* in J. Z. W. L. VI. (1868) 4.

¹³Man dürfe nicht von einer drei Tausend jährigen Tradition sprechen wenn man sie als bereits fast zwei tausend Jahre entchlafen betrachte. Der Faden der Tradition sei in der Gegenwart gerade wieder angeknüpft. Das in gesetzliche Erstarrung gerathene religiöse Bewusstsein der Gesamtheit habe seit längerer Zeit begonnen flüssig zu werden, wieder sei eine lebendige Anschauung erwacht, wenn sie auch noch nicht zur vollen Klarheit sich entwickelt habe. See *Protokolle der dritten Versammlung deutscher Rabbiner*, 160.

recognize Geiger as an associate. This aged rabbi could not understand that a new generation had arisen that demanded a reformulation of Jewish values. He contended that freedom of research as required by the advocates of the what was known as the *Wissenschaft des Judenthums* was intolerable. The rabbi had simply to conduct his office along traditional lines; it was not his concern to ask concerning or inquire into the reason of religious ceremony or custom, he had only to decide according to the dicta of tradition as formulated in the code. The refusal of Tiktin to recognize Geiger as his associate in the performance of the functions of the rabbinical office led the board of directors of the congregation, in their desire to solve the difficulties of the situation to suggest that Geiger be designated the preacher of the congregation while Tiktin continued to be known as the rabbi. This suggestion was tantamount to recognizing an old and a new Judaism, the old embodied in strict rabbinism as represented by Tiktin, the new spelling modernism as appearing in Geiger, a young man of modern training. Geiger refused to lend himself to such an arrangement; he contended that if the new conditions in Jewry demanded men of modern training in the rabbinical office, then it was intolerable to refuse to such men the recognition of rabbinical authority. The threatening break between the old and new could be healed only if the people had before them in the activity of the rabbi-preacher the demonstration of the possibility of the joining of the spirit of tradition with the spirit of the modern age.

Tiktin continuing in his recalcitrant attitude, the board of directors found themselves compelled to suspend him from office. The aged rabbi now addressed a number of his colleagues on the subject in dispute and published their opinions in a pamphlet.¹⁴ These rabbis declared unreservedly for the absolute and eternal authority of all Talmudical legislation, as "binding for all time upon the Jews and not one of these commandments or prohibitions, be the character what it may, can ever be abolished or modified by any human authority."

Fortified by these unequivocal declarations, Tiktin charged the

¹⁴*Darstellung des Sachverhältnisses in seiner hiesigen Rabbinatsangelegenheit.*

board of directors with malfeasance in office for having selected as rabbi a man "who in spoken and written discourse denies unreservedly the authoritative validity of traditional Judaism and whose call and mission appears to be to extirpate it root and branch for all time."

Thus challenged, the board of directors in their turn addressed a communication to a number of the leading rabbis of Europe requesting their opinion on the compatibility of free research with the performance of the functions involved in the conduct of the rabbinical office. The seventeen answers received were published in two volumes.¹⁵ These volumes were the most important publication that had appeared up to that time in the controversies engendered by the liberal religious tendencies among Jews; these rabbis¹⁶ all endorsed the position of Geiger in the premises. This collection of opinions is notable inasmuch as the new situation is viewed from many angles by men of profound learning and clear vision.

The Geiger-Tiktin affair served a useful end inasmuch as it called forth a clear expression of the pros and cons of the situation. But perhaps the chief gain lay in the fact that the responses of the seventeen rabbis gave evidence of the fact that they like Geiger were convinced that the new valuation of Judaism involved no break with the past but was a re-interpretation of the finest spiritual products of that past in the light of the greatly changed outlook of Jewish life in the present.

Geiger then, and those of his contemporaries who sympathized with him rested their reforms on a historical basis. He viewed the whole course of the development of the Jewish religion from the very beginning. He recognized the increasing purpose running through the ages. The deliverance from Egypt, the wandering in the wilderness, the entrance into and the life in Palestine, the preaching of the prophets, the Babylonian exile, the second Palestinian commonwealth, the dispersion in Greek speaking lands be-

¹⁵*Rabbinische Gutachten über die Verträglichkeit der freien Forschung mit dem Rabbineramate.*

¹⁶For a detailed account see Philipson *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, 72-101.

fore the Christian era, the destruction of Jerusalem with the consequent settling of Jews in all parts of the civilized world, the harrowing experiences in the centuries of persecution, the emancipation of the modern age, all these phases in the century-long travail of the Jewish people with their accompanying spiritual uplift or depression, were parts of one connected whole; each age produced its own characteristic tendency and so, too, the modern age was signalized by the reform movement, the latest link in this chain of development. Geiger saw the story of Judaism clearly and he saw it whole. How clearly appears from many a passage in his writings one of which may be reproduced as indicative of all the rest: "How Judaism arose and gradually assumed the Biblical form, how the various movements within it whose individuality we still recognize, adjusted themselves to one another, how from the same moving forces the law as developed in the Talmudical discussions gradually emerged to the forefront, how finally the mediaeval age spent itself often meritoriously but with only meager results in commenting upon and expounding this Talmudical legislation, how the mission of the present is to redeem the spirit from these petrified forms and thus to introduce Judaism into the thick of human activity as a life giving, spiritual and religious force; this is a world mission, for which the present age seeks its organs and will find them ———. Let us honor worthily the great names that have become historical, let us honor their memory; but then courageously forward, new aims before us! Let not the mouldy smell of the past as it arises from graves benumb us, but let the energizing breath of the atmosphere of the future be wafted toward us."¹⁷

At the very outset of his career Geiger indicated the method which he intended to pursue in his work of reform. Fully convinced even then of the necessity of building the structure of the reform movement on a historical and scientific basis in order to demonstrate its place in the development of Jewish religious effort and aspiration, he took steps towards this end. With his keen historical sense, his wide learning and his philosophical grasp he

¹⁷Kley und Rapoport, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, V. 251.

understood the meaning of the larger forces at work in his generation, and recognized that the liberation of thought apparent everywhere was affecting the Jews also and hence Judaism both in the outer form that it had assumed during its centuries existence and in its inner content must be interpreted in accordance with the new outlook of the modern age. This re-interpretation must rest upon a Jewish foundation. The Jewish past must be viewed from a new angle of vision. The volumes of Jewish lore must be studied in the light of the conditions of the times and places in which they had been written. The forces at work in Jewish life must be learned from the literary monuments that had survived from days past. This systematic study of the productions of the Jewish spirit was called the Science of Judaism.¹⁸ (*Die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*.) This was the first article of Geiger's program, namely to demonstrate by the study of Jewish sources, the development and growth of Jewish institutions and by thus demonstrating the fact of such development and growth to secure the justification for the reform movement and ensure its place as the latest phase in the development of Judaism.¹⁹ It is true that this had been the thought of that band of young men, chief of whom was Leopold Zunz, who had organized in 1819 the Society for the Science of Judaism. The great monument of this pre-Geiger movement was Zunz' epoch making work *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* in which the author by an exhaustive study of the homiletic works of the Jews proved that preaching in the vernacular far from being an innovation had been in vogue in Jewish communities of aforesaid times. Preaching in the vernacular was one of the so-called innovations of the reformers; such preaching had been practically unknown among the Jews for several centuries; Zunz proved that this was due simply to the conditions of Jewish life; the need for such preaching being now again felt, it was quite in accord with the Jewish spirit. This work of Zunz furnished a brilliant

¹⁸The term Science of Judaism which for want of a better we are compelled to use must be understood in the original and larger meaning of the term "science" as "knowledge," and not in the restricted sense which it now usually has of "natural science."

¹⁹Phillipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, 66.

example of the possibilities of founding reforms on a scientific basis. Geiger made such scientific study the point of departure for his activity as a reformer.

When twenty-five years of age, he began the publication of his magazine *Die Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer judische Theologie* (Scientific Magazine for Jewish Theology). During the thirteen years of the existence of this magazine, he published in its pages many profound and erudite studies as well as a series of brilliant articles on present religious conditions that necessitated the movement for reform. The one lasting result of the conference of rabbis which he convened at Wiesbaden where he began his rabbinical career, was the impetus to make studies of various perplexing subjects that were demanding attention and from these studies to draw conclusions for the guidance of contemporaneous Jewish communities.²⁰ In a letter written to his friend J. Derenbourg in Paris on January 16, 1838, in a moment of deep depression, Geiger after deploring the difficulties encountered in the struggle with orthodoxy, states that he may find it necessary to retire from the field of active life "and to devote himself to pure learning in order to find and to give expression there to the truths which still form the center of my efforts and to leave their practical application to others."²¹ In these words he indicates briefly but fully his idea of the institution of reforms; the principles and truths were to be sought in study; thereupon they were to be applied practically. For him the reform movement was not opportunistic, but it was spirit of Judaism's spirit; it was as essential a product of this spirit as were any of the movements in Jewish life from the very beginning. As his life advanced he became more and more convinced that this was the true method for the placing of the reform movement on a solid foundation as grows clear when one examines the last productions of his pen that appeared in the second magazine that he founded, his *Juedische Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft und Leben* (Jewish Magazine for Knowledge and Life, 1861-1875).

²⁰See letter written by Geiger to Jacob Auerbach, August 22, 1837, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 99.

²¹*Abraham Geiger's Briefe an J. Derenbourg* herausgegeben von Ludwig Geiger, *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* 1896, p. 236-8.

The opening article of that magazine may be considered as expressing his matured thought; it is remarkable how closely it adheres to the ideas to which he gave voice twenty-five years previously on this subject; he never swerved from the position that the knowledge of the past productions of the Jewish spirit must form the foundation whereon all Jewish effort must build. The life of the present must draw its inspiration and its strength from the strain and striving of all the ages past.

The belief in Judaism's gradual development as evidenced by the study of the religio-literary products of ages past being the prime article of Geiger's program as a reformer his special attitudes in the practical religious activities of his generation naturally rested upon this. He deprecated constantly revolutionary and radical methods. Reform must be gradual not revolutionary;²² changes must be gradual, not violent;²³ reform must be constructive not merely destructive;²⁴ reform must be not a movement of shreds and patches, but a comprehensive understanding of the philosophy of Judaism.²⁵ Neither must the reformer act simply as an individual but he must have in mind the religious welfare of all Jewry; he is a part of a great historical community from which in his zeal for reforming he may not cut himself loose; hence reforms must be achieved within the congregation as a link with the whole body of Judaism;²⁶ yet the needs and the rights of the individual may not be sacrificed to the blind fetich worship of the past and an undue regard for catholic Israel.²⁷ His personal attitude in this matter is clearly expressed in a letter written to the Board of Directors of the Breslau Congregation in answer to a request for an explanation of his attitude as a reformer. In this letter he wrote as follows: "I have always advocated such true and real

²²*Nachgelassene Schriften*, I. 205-6. *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, VI., 4.

²³*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 196, 202., 206-7.

²⁴"Mein Streben ging niemals dahin blos abzurwerfen, etc." *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 141.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 188 ff.

²⁶*Ibid.*, I, 205.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 206. See also *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, III., 216-18.

progress whose aim it is to strengthen the pure divine content of Judaism in the heart by freeing it of temporal dross; I have been and am constantly striving to give religious forms an interpretation which is likely to awaken to life and kindle sentiment

* * * The rabbi who is sincerely concerned for the welfare of the whole congregation and who has the religious life of all at heart will act as a conciliating, enlightening, stimulating influence among the warring factions which are now so much in evidence; he will strive to maintain himself free from partisanship and the more difficult this is in the violent storms of the present the more must he aim to attain this position.²⁸ He stood pre-eminently for sane, historical reform. There was nothing revolutionary or radical in his make-up yet he counselled patience in dealing with the radical temper; in speaking of the radicals in his own congregation he said "I desire to quiet them, but not to aggravate them and drive them out" (ich will sie beruhigen aber nicht reizen und henauswerfen.)²⁹ His feeling in this matter of radical reform was most clearly brought out in his relations with the Berlin Reform Congregation whose radical program he could not endorse. He felt that this congregation had broken in a measure with the historic spirit of Judaism and produced an unnecessary schism. For this reason he refused twice the offer to become the rabbi of this congregation, the first time when the congregation was organized in 1845, and the second time after the death of Holdheim in 1860. His various expressions on this subject of a schism in Judaism show how fine was his understanding of the situation. He feared not the cry that was constantly raised by the orthodox party that reform would create a schism.³⁰ In a letter to Zunz in 1841 he wrote that a schism was the only means of salvation in the intolerable condition of Judaism;³¹ to save the situation schism was justifiable, but a schism may not be made intentionally as was done by the Frankfort reformers when they organized the Society of the Friends of Reform;³² if a schism is

²⁸*Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, VI., 160.

²⁹*Ibid.*, V. 192.

³⁰*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 102, 103.

³¹*Ibid.*, V. 155.

³²Philipson *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, p. 147.

the result of sincere and conscientious effort for the salvation of Judaism, well and good; Geiger desired to accomplish "the reform of the whole community;"³³ when the Berlin congregation was to be organized he expressed the hope that it would not cause a schism; schism may be necessary but it must be a healthy schism³⁴ and not a radical breaking away from the regular course of Jewish development. Since he considered the Berlin movement unjustifiably schismatic he felt that he could not respond to the call to become the leader of that congregation. Radical methods though seemingly effective at first and attractive to many, because of their startling and sensational features, did not appeal to Geiger whose point of view was formed by a fine blending of appreciation of past achievement, present need and future possibilities. As he advanced in life, this attitude of mind became more and more pronounced; he gave expression to it in a hundred and one ways; let one of these expressions, penned in 1861, be cited as indicative of his unceasing faith in the doctrine of development and in the ultimate triumph of the liberal movement: "Let natural development pursue its own way; I hurry not; every day enlarges and fortifies my position * * * and time remains after all a mighty ally."³⁵

These were the leading features of Geiger's thought as a reformer. His course of action in the stirring events that took place in his lifetime and in which he was one of the most prominent figures furnishes an illuminating commentary of this program. His feeling that reforms should emanate neither from an individual rabbi nor an individual congregation but should be the concern of the community of Israel led him to call the conference of rabbis at Wiesbaden in 1837. The meager success of this initial movement for concerted action did not deter him from further efforts in this direction and when Ludwig Philippson issued the call for a rabbinical conference for the consideration of the many per-

³³*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 169, "Ich predige Reform der Gesamtheit."

³⁴*Ibid.*, V. 178-9.

³⁵Lassen wir der natürlichen Bewegung nur ihre eigene Entwicklung; ich eile nicht; ein jeder Tag erweitert und befestigt mein Terrain—die Zeit bleibt doch eine mächtige Bundesgenossin. *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V. 263.

plexing problems that were vexing the Jews, Abraham Geiger heartily supported the call; in the three great conferences held at Brunswick, Frankfort on the Main and Breslau, in the years 1844, 1845 and 1846, Geiger took a very leading part, if not the leading part;⁸⁶ the purpose of these conferences was to arrive at some solution of the problems raised by the position of the Jews in the modern environment; whatever may be the verdict of the success or failure of the conferences it must always be conceded that they were a conscientious and sincere effort to promote the spirit of union and to continue the line of historical development in Judaism by interpreting the traditions in the light of present conditions. The conferences rested upon the thesis that reform is the latest phase in the development of the spirit of Judaism. This was essentially Geiger's standpoint and therefore the convening of these conferences apart from any question of their success or failure must be considered a practical demonstration of the standpoint which Geiger and those who thought with him represented.

The feeling that the liberal movement to be effective must rest upon united action and not be a matter of individual whim or caprice also led Geiger early in his career to advocate the founding of a seminary for the training of rabbis for modern congregations. The rabbinical seminary of Breslau founded in 1854 had proved a keen disappointment to Geiger who was rabbi of the congregation of that city. He charged the seminary with failure to educate rabbis to grapple with the modern situation in Jewry; he claimed that its course of study was dominated by the spirit of pilpulism and that no provision was made whereby the students would receive guidance for effective work as leaders of modern congregations.⁸⁷ The Breslau seminary represented reaction according to Geiger's view. Therefore he advocated constantly the foundation of a rabbinical school whose curriculum should be fashioned along progressive lines.⁸⁸ This wish was realized when the *Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* was founded in Berlin in 1871. Here Geiger taught until his death. Here he reared disci-

⁸⁶ Philipson *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, 197-317 passim.

⁸⁷ *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, I. 168-74.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* Was that Noth? III. 254.

ples who carried into the spheres of their activity the ideas which he taught. The *Hochschule*, like the conferences, represented constructive work of a high order and both were regarded by Geiger as containing the highest possibilities for the positive achievements of the reform movement.

The reaction against the liberal movements both in government and in religion which characterized the earlier half of the nineteenth century was much in evidence particularly in Germany and Austria in the sixth decade of the last century. As in Christianity, so in Judaism this was the case. The movement known as neo-orthodoxy whose chief protagonist was Samson Raphael Hirsch, a leader of unusual power and a scholar of great gifts was attracting many by its appeal to the romantic views then much in vogue. Geiger, the acknowledged leader of liberal Judaism, broke many a lance in his contests with the champions of reactionism and romanticism. His trenchant essay *Alte Romantik, neue Reaktion*³⁹ set forth in forcible style the real inwardness of the contemporary reactionary movements in Judaism and elsewhere which movements were simply modern forms of an earlier romanticism. He felt that this reactionism could be met most effectively by gatherings of Jewish leaders who should discuss the problems that were troubling the welfare of Israel. In that same article "What is Needed?"⁴⁰ in which he had urged the necessity of founding a theological seminary he had advocated the convening of a "large gatherings for the discussion of Jewish questions." Many rabbis evidently were in sympathy with this for in 1868 the rabbinical conference of Cassel convened, the first gathering of Jewish leaders in Germany since 1846. This conference is chiefly significant for having paved the way for the famous synods of Leipzig and Augsburg in 1869 and 1871, the first assemblies in the history of modern Judaism in which rabbis and laymen came together for deliberations upon religious problems. Geiger had struck the keynote for the calling of such assemblies when he wrote in 1865 "By such means only does regenerated interest as well as mutual understanding and enlightenment arise. This is the center of gravity

³⁹*Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, I. 246.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, VI., 169.

of the whole matter. In such assemblies, general practical questions which are continually cropping up, spring forth of themselves. They can not be prescribed beforehand. It is a mistake to insist continually upon a declaration of a practical tangible purpose for such an assembly when the practical achievement lies in the very convening of such a large body which is susceptible of every sort of stimulation and is ready to lend its strength to every movement looking toward revival and improvement in wider and narrower circles. Finished results and definite aims should not be presented to it but means should be offered to bring about a more correct knowledge of Judaism and to effect a blending of the religious spirit with life by which means the adequate result will be accomplished in every instance. Every epoch produces its problems which affect now a larger, now a smaller sphere but which are not solved properly because general interest and the vigor of combined action are lacking.⁴¹ In the synods Geiger was the leading rabbinical figure. He submitted a number of important propositions. He felt that the pronouncements of such representative assemblies would carry much weight in Jewish communities even though they had not ecclesiastical authority to coerce the acceptance of their findings. Even though the synods did not accomplish what Geiger and others hoped for in unravelling the tangled threads, yet were they an earnest endeavor to meet a most perplexing situation;⁴² they gave evidence of Geiger's constructive abilities and of his clear grasp of the needs of his generation.

Much of the practical activity of the reformers was concerned of necessity with the ritual. In the ritual of a religion the principles of the faith receive voice. The prayer book is the expression of the corporate religious conscience. Among the Jews the prayer book represented a growth of many centuries. Many of the prayers expressed thoughts and hopes which were at variance with the religious outlook of the Jew in the modern world. Therefore we find that almost from the beginning the reformers occupied them-

⁴¹*Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* III., 254-55. See also *Views on the Synod* (compiled by Committee of Central Conference of American Rabbis), 39, Baltimore, 1905.

⁴²Philipson *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, 398-460.

selves with making such changes in the traditional prayers and the whole mode of conducting the services as seemed to them to be demanded by the changed conditions, thoughts, beliefs and requirements of the modern Jew. This resulted unfortunately in great confusion for many prayer books were produced either by individual rabbis or congregations. True there had been from time out of mind different orders of liturgy among Jews that had found expression in the divergencies of the so-called Ashkenazic and Sephardic rituals; but this line of cleavage did not impair the authority of either ritual among its own followers; further the differences between the two rituals were concerned not as much with beliefs as with expressions and customs. Thus there were practically two liturgies but within its own sphere each had unquestioned allegiance. With the arising of the liberal movement this body of liturgical authority was broken up. The prophet of old had complained that as many cities as there were in Israel, so many altars were there. Thus also it might have been said in the early years of the reform movement, that as many reform rabbis of note as there were, so many prayer books were there. This was one of the necessary accompaniments perhaps of the new movement. As soon as the necessity of change is recognized and acknowledged, the individual views of what changes shall be made seek expression. After a time there is a sifting of these views and the reformers too are found to have a common ground. This consensus of religious opinion and expression among reformers produced after many years the Union Prayer Book which has been accepted by the reform congregations of the United States with few exceptions as the ritual embodying their religious beliefs and aspirations.

Much of Geiger's religious activity was concerned with these questions of the liturgy. One of his early studies was a comprehensive review and criticism of the Hamburg Temple Prayer Book;⁴³ in the great debates on the liturgy which were the chief feature of the Frankfort rabbinical conference, he took a leading part; in his own congregation at Breslau he began making reforms in the ritual in 1844; he himself was not eager to produce a new prayer book; as long as changes in the ritual were in the making,

⁴³*Der Hamburger Tempelstreit, Nachgelassene Schriften, I., 113-197.*

he did not feel that they should be fixed in printed form; while the changes were fluid, there might be inconsistencies here and there which would not arouse comment for after all the expression that religious feeling and sentiment took was not to be measured by the rules of consistency; but as soon as these changes were fixed in a printed book the inconsistencies would be glaring.⁴⁴ Still the board of directors of the congregation was insistent upon the preparation and publication of a prayer book that should meet the religious requirements of the congregation. Geiger thereupon prepared a plan for a new prayer book⁴⁵ and after the lapse of a few years the book which embodied the principles here stated appeared.⁴⁶ A careful examination of this book reveals many inconsistencies just as Geiger had feared; these he removed in great part in the second edition of the prayer book published sixteen years later. This second prayer book was planned and executed along the lines of the suggestions which he submitted to the Leipzig Synod⁴⁷ and the elaborate plan for a new prayer book which he drew up shortly thereafter.⁴⁸ At this time Geiger was rabbi in Frankfort on the Main. His successor at Breslau, Dr. M. Joel, known for his fine studies in Jewish philosophy, had published early in 1867 an essay in defense of the traditional prayer book; he argued for the retention of all the traditional prayers even those that petitioned for a restoration of the sacrifices, for the coming of the Personal Messiah, and for the bodily resurrection.⁴⁹ Joel was an adherent of the position taken by the Breslau theological seminary which demanded absolute conformity to the rabbinical tradition in practice while permitting latitude of thought. Thus although the restoration of the sacrifices might not be desired nor believed in, still must the petition for such restoration be retained in the liturgy, because the traditional prayer book must

⁴⁴*Introduction to Prayer Book V*, Breslau, 1854.

⁴⁵*Grundlage und Plan zu einen neuen Gebetbuche*, Breslau 1849.

⁴⁶סדר תפלה דבר יום ביומו Israelitisches Gebetbuch für den öffentlichen Gottesdienst in ganzen Jahre. Breslau 1854.

⁴⁷*Thesen für die Leipziger Versammlung, Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, VII., p. 162.

⁴⁸*Plan zu einen neuen Gebetbuche*, Ibid., 241-280.

⁴⁹*Zur Orientirung in der Cultusfrage* 1867.

not be tampered with. Geiger, to whom this attitude was intolerable and who frequently castigated the Breslau school with all the scorn at his command, answered Joel's brochure in a lengthy criticism.⁵⁹ Joel's moving thought was the integrity of catholic Israel; this must be maintained even at the expense of individual conviction and intellectual honesty; such was also the position of Zacharias Frankel; Geiger on the other hand, championed the necessity of progressive thought and of loyalty to truth above all other considerations.

Enough has been written to make clear Geiger's general principles as a religious reformer. It remains to take up the special points of his practical program which gave point to the theories which he held.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE SERVICE. At the Frankfort rabbinical conference in 1845 where the question of changes in the liturgy was discussed for the first time in a public assembly, Geiger declared unequivocally that there was no prohibition anywhere against using languages besides the Hebrew in prayer. He stated that the ancient authorities permitted prayer to be spoken in any language. As for himself he deemed it desirable that the service should be conducted in the vernacular because "all our deepest feelings and sentiments, all our highest thoughts receive expression through it." Hebrew, he went on to say, is no longer a living tongue; it is painfully apparent how listless and inattentive congregations are for example while the section from the Torah is being read. In answer to the claim which had been advanced that the very foundations of Judaism would be shattered were Hebrew to be eliminated from the service he wished to say that he considered Judaism to be in a perilous state indeed if it required the prop of a language to sustain it. If they were to agree that the Hebrew language is an absolute essential, this would be tantamount to declaring Judaism to be a national religion since a peculiar language is the sign patent of nationality; and it was certain that none of the rabbis in the assembly would agree that Judaism is dependent upon the existence of a separate nationality.

⁵⁹*Etwas über Glauben und Beten. Zu Schutz und Trutz.* J. Z. W. L. VII., 1-59.

However when the practical issue presented itself to him of preparing a new prayer book he found that the question was not to be solved by theoretical considerations only; memories and sentiments of a great past had to be considered as well as the views and needs of the present. In the introduction to the prayer book which he issued in 1854 he wrote: "The significance of the prayers consists not alone in their content but also in their traditional forms, in the verbiage in which they have been bequeathed to us, hence, also in the Hebrew language. This must remain therefore with few exceptions the language of prayer." The exceptions were the prayers inserted during the service and spoken by the rabbi, such as the prayer for the government, special prayers for the sick, for a newly born child, etc.; such prayers were to be uttered in German. A German translation accompanied the Hebrew prayers. This translation was not a literal version but rather a paraphrase which reflected the contents of the original.

In 1860, Geiger issued a pamphlet in which he discussed anew the question of the reform of the liturgy.⁵¹ The views here expressed were much the same as had found expression in the preface to the prayer book. Although the Hebrew prayers no longer aroused devotion because of the unfamiliarity of the worshippers with the language, although too, there could be no doubt that prayers in the vernacular would do this to a much greater degree, still because of the great significance of the Hebrew language in the development of Judaism it must retain for the present at least a large place in the public service. "A wise compromise must be arrived at in this matter," he wrote, "it is possible, yes, it is altogether likely, that a not distant future will demand and grant the changes more readily; at this time both the present need and pious recollection must be satisfied." Therefore he suggested the following as a working plan: The prayers for silent devotion as well as those for special occasions spoken by the rabbi were to be in the vernacular. The other prayers must be judiciously divided between the two languages. But a certain harmony must be preserved; there must not be an indiscriminate mixing of Hebrew and

⁵¹*Nothwendigkeit und Maass einer Reform des jüdischen Gottesdienstes.* Republished in *Nachgelassene Schriften*, I., 203.

German prayers. The German element of the service should be grouped about the sermon. The order of service would thus be: a short Hebrew *Schacharit* service, dotted at intervals with prayers for silent devotion in German; the reading from the Torah in Hebrew; a selection from the prophets in German; German prayers for the congregation, the government and special occasions; some German prayers and songs; the sermon; a German song and a German prayer; the abbreviated *Mussaf* service in Hebrew, with a German prayer for silent devotion to close the service for Sabbath and Holidays. Geiger says further: "This question of language is the most difficult point in the new arrangement of the public service; it is quite possible that no suggestions will give entire satisfaction to all parties. Here if anywhere the demand is justified that each and everyone sacrifice something of his own desires for the good of the whole. May the one party consider that it is their duty to co-operate towards the end that the house of worship become not altogether closed to the young, and the other party see to it that they drive not the older generation out of the house of God."⁵²

In 1868, in an article, entitled "Unser Gottesdienst,"⁵³ he reverts to the subject of the language of the service; while the exigencies of the present demand the greater portion of the service to be in Hebrew, yet he felt that this would change in the near future when the greater portion of the service must be in the vernacular.⁵⁴ Future generations in all likelihood would become less and less familiar with the Hebrew and the service would have to be accommodated to this condition.⁵⁵ However for the present, conditions were such as required the retention of the Hebrew. His last utterance which we have on the subject is contained in his plan for a new prayer book which he drew up for presentation to the Synod which met at Leipsig in 1869.⁵⁶ In this plan he

⁵²*Nachgelassene Schriften*, I., 210-215.

⁵³W. Z. J. L. VI., 1-21.

⁵⁴Die Geschichte hat das Urtheil gesprochen wenn es such noch nicht vollzogen ist. Unser Gottesdienst muss und wird in naher Zukunft seine sprachliche Neugeburt feiern. *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁵Gottesdienstliche Feier ist der Menschen wegen und nicht der Mensch nach ihr einzurichten. *Ibid.*

⁵⁶*Plan zu einen Neuen Gebetbuche* J. Z. W. L. VII., 241-280.

laid down a number of guiding principles. The first and second of these touched the subject of the language of the service. Here he says essentially what he had said fifteen years previously in his preface to his first prayer book. The greater portion of the service was to be conducted in Hebrew; however, there were to be a number of prayers and meditations in German. There was also to be a free German translation which should attempt to reproduce the spirit of the original rather than aim to be an exact and literal reproduction of the Hebrew words.

These suggestions were embodied in his second prayer book published in 1870.

We have here an exemplification of Geiger's attitude of mind. Although fully convinced that the vernacular should displace the Hebrew almost entirely as the language of prayer, still he felt that such a proceeding in his age and generation would be so revolutionary as to detach the congregation that would adopt it from the main body of the synagogue.

This is what actually happened to the Berlin reform congregation under Holdheim's leadership. Holdheim carried out his theories to their logical end no matter what the cost. He had not the historical sense nor the consciousness of the solidarity of Israel that Geiger had. Geiger felt that reform must move slowly, not by leaps and bounds; hence frequently his practice lagged far behind his theory; he desired constructive reform, which should permeate all Jewry; his aim was to retain as far as possible the connection with the whole house of Israel and therefore he was content to sacrifice theory for the time, assured that in the progress of the years his theory would be translated into practice. He looked far ahead and for this reason was content even though in his own day, practice did not keep pace with his religious outlook.

THE CONTENTS OF THE PRAYER BOOK. In Geiger's opinion the contents of the traditional prayer book required elimination, change or recasting as the case might be. He contended that the service was too long and wearied the worshippers; therefore it must be abbreviated; all unnecessary repetitions and unessential and unmeaning portions must be eliminated. He urged that the more crude religious conceptions of an earlier day as embodied in a

number of prayers must give way to the less crude conceptions of a later age. In this category might be named.

- (a) Anthropomorphic designations of the Deity, frequent in the *piyutim*;⁵⁷ these should be eliminated.
- (b) The enumeration of the various classes of angels and the description of their activity; these too should be removed from the prayers.⁵⁸
- (c) The belief in immortality must find expression not alone in the doctrine of the bodily resurrection, but also in that of the spiritual immortality.

But chiefly must the world mission of Israel be emphasized in the liturgy; therefore the nationalistic conception of Israel so prominent in the traditional prayers must give way to the universalistic. The separation between Israel and the other peoples should find no expression in the prayers but rather the hope that such barriers gradually disappear. So also all prayers for the restitution of the Jewish state in Palestine, the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem, the re-institution of the sacrificial service and the re-gathering of all the dispersed of Israel and their return to Palestine must be eliminated for they are not expressive of our thought.⁵⁹

⁵⁷Liturgical poems.

⁵⁸cf also preface to Geiger's second prayer book. Berlin 1870. In the 1854 edition of the prayer book Geiger retained the traditional angelology. In the second prayer book we note changes in accordance with his growing thought. Thus in the *Schacharit Kedushah* he substitutes the word *ונאמר* for the phrase *והאפנים וחיות הקדש... שרפים*; so also in the *Schacharit Shemoneh Esreh*, the second prayer book omits the phrase *כשם שמקדישים אותו בשמי מרום* and substitutes the word *ונאמר* for *לעמתם ברוך יאמרו*

⁵⁹Thus in the fifteenth benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh* he omits the words *והשב את העבודה לדביר ביתך*. At the close of the 18 benedictions he omits the entire petition *שיבנה בית המקדש... יהי רצון*. In the *Mussof* for the three high feasts he omits the petition *כתבנו ונתגדל כבודו ותבנהו מהרה* and *ותגדל כבודו*; so also in the benediction *ואלהינו ואהינו אבותינו*; in the same *Mussof* he omits the petition for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the restoration of Israel to Palestine. True he was not entirely consistent in this matter in his 1854 edition of the prayer book for here and there some expressions of this character were retained; these he removed entirely in the second prayer book where for the traditional petition for the return, the rebuilding of the temple, etc., in the *Mussof* prayer for the holy days, he

To utter such petitions would be to utter untruths. For them the prayer for the coming of the time when the brotherhood of man will be achieved should be substituted.⁶⁰

With the passing of time Geiger became more and more convinced that the chief point of difference between the traditional and the liberal school lay in the interpretation of Israel's mission. He was a prophet of universalistic Judaism; the nationalistic interpretation of Judaism's future seemed to him to misread altogether the purpose of God in His preservation of the Jewish people. Hence he changed or omitted all expressions in the traditional prayer book which reflected the nationalistic view.⁶¹ In accordance with this interpretation of Israel's work in the world the traditional explanation of the dispersion also underwent a change in his thought. Far from looking upon the dispersion as a misfortune or a curse, and the present state of the Jews a state of exile he considered the loss of Palestine and the consequent dispersion as a blessing, a part of God's plan for the larger work of Israel.⁶² Therefore his conception of *Tisha b'ab*, the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem assumed a form different from the traditional view. The prayer which he wrote for the morning service of that day interprets the fall of Jerusalem and the tragical

substitutes the following universalistic petition: **וביתך בית תפלה לכל העם יקרא אבינו מלכנו גלה כבוד מלכותך עלינו לעיני כל חי: ארשת שפתינו תקבל ברצון ונדיבת פינו ראה נא ביום (השבת הזה וביום) הכפרים הזה שכתבת עלינו כתרך**

⁶⁰*Plan zu einen Neuen Gebetbuche*, J. Z. W. L. VII., 245-7.

⁶¹Thus he either omits such petitions as **והביאנו לשלום מארבע** or changes them to express the universalistic view, e. g., for the traditional benediction **והושע יי** he substitutes **והושע יי** את עמך את שארית ישראל בארבע כנפות הארץ: ברוך אתה יי מושיע שארית עמו ישראל

⁶²Thus he omits the petition **והביאנו לשלום מארבע** in which the land of Israel's present sojourn is designated a land of captivity; so also he omits the **יהי רצון** in the traditional prayer book which was spoken before the Torah was returned to the Ark, because this petition contains supplications for deliverance from present exile, for the rebuilding of the temple, etc. Cf. German paraphrase of benedictions VII-XV of the *Shemoneh Esreh* in his prayer book; also his German substitute for the long penitential **הוא רחום**

experience of Israel in the world since then in the light of the universal mission.⁶³

In his interpretation of Israel's place in the world then he substituted the universalistic conception for the traditional nationalistic; he claimed that Israel lives no longer as a nation in the hearts and wishes of the present generation; it is regarded as a religious community (Glaubensgemeinde); the prayers must therefore be changed accordingly and the expression of the universal mission throughout the world must find place in the prayers in lieu of the nationalism and palestinianism of the traditional prayer book.⁶⁴

When then of the belief that Israel was chosen by God for its particular work in the world? Geiger fully believed that Israel was set apart for a special purpose but he contended that all such chauvenistic prayers and expressions as exalted Israel at the expense of other peoples must be changed or eliminated.⁶⁵ The boastful notion that merely because God has chosen Israel, this people

⁶³"The fire which destroyed Jerusalem was to be also a fire of purification for Israel and humanity. Israel was to examine into its way and remove all the dross and illumine mankind with the light of its teaching. Our fathers have had to endure much; yes, our time of suffering is not yet past; but Thy name is being acknowledged more and more among men and Israel is being gradually recognized." (*Israelitisches Gebetbuch*, von Abraham Geiger, 45.)

⁶⁴*Gesammelte Schriften*, I., 207.

⁶⁵Thus in the ברכת התורה he omits the words מכל העמים after בחר; in the prayer ובא לציון he omits the phrase והבדילנו מן התעים; in שנגלה לאבותינו והדעים את רצונו וברך עלינו he substitutes the words אתם את בריתו והנחילנו תריתו שלא עשנו כגויי הארצות ולא שמנו כמשפחות האדמה שלא שם חלקנו בהם וגרלנו ככל המום. In the *Kiddush* for Sabbath eve he omits the words אהבה רבה after ואתנו קדשת מכל העמים. In the fourth benediction he omits the phrase ובנו בחרת מכל עם ולשון ולא נתתו יי אלהינו לגויי הארצות ולא הנחלתו מלכנו לעובדי פסילים. In the *Mussaf* prayer for ראש חדש Geiger omits the words כי בעמד ישראל בחרת מכל האמות. In the *Habdalah* service he omits the phrase בין ישראל לעמים. In the prayer אתה בחרתנו in the evening service for the three high feasts he omits the words ורממתנו מכל הלשונות and מכל העמים; so also in the similar prayer on *Rosh Hashanah* and *Yom Hakippurim*.

was therefore better than other peoples was irreligious; quite contrariwise must this conception be interpreted; because God had chosen Israel, therefore the obligation lay upon this people to attempt to become more and more worthy of this distinction by exemplary conduct.⁶⁶ The choice entailed responsibility not privilege. In a line with his conception of the universalistic character of Israel's mission and his substitution of the world in place of Palestine as the sphere of Israel's work was his interpretation of the Messianic doctrine. We note that with the passing of the years he repudiated the traditional belief in the coming of a personal Messiah who was to gather the people of Israel from all parts of the earth whereunto they had been dispersed and lead them back to Palestine; for this conception he substituted the doctrine of the coming of the Messianic Age, the realization on earth of the ideals of universal peace and good will.⁶⁷

Thus was Geiger a true prophet of universalistic Judaism; none appreciated more thoroughly than did he the significance of Israel's wonderful preservation; none sympathized more completely than did he with all the harrowing experiences of Israel among the nations of the world. And because of these things he could delve more deeply than most men into the meaning of it all; his was

⁶⁶Gesammelte Schriften I. 208; see also J. Z. W. L. VI., 19; VII., 164.

⁶⁷A comparison of the second edition of Geiger's prayer book with the first reveals some interesting facts in this matter. In the first edition he was not entirely consistent; he retained some prayers for the coming of the personal Messiah; these he either eliminated or changed in the second edition of the prayer book. Thus in the first benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh* he retained the words **וּמְבִיא גָאֹל** in his first prayer book; in the second he changed this to the phrase **וּמְבִיא גְאוּלָּה**; in his first prayer book he retained the petition for the coming of the personal Messiah **אֵת צִמְחָה דְּדוֹר**; this is omitted in the second prayer book; it is noticeable, however, that, in the German rendering of the prayer in the first prayer book there is no mention whatsoever of the personal Messiah, and the entire petition for Israel's restoration is given a universalistic coloring. Similarly in the words inserted on the holidays in the benediction **רִצָּה** we find that in the first prayer book Geiger retained the phrase **וּזְכוּרֵנוּ מִשִּׁיחַ בֶּן דָּוִד** but omitted it in the second prayer book. In the first prayer book he retained the references to the Messiah in the petition **וּבִכְנֵי תֵן** on *Rosh Hashanah* and *Yom Hakippurim*; he changed these in the second prayer book.

a philosophy of history which recognizing God in all and above all, fitted Israel into its place in the general scheme of humanity's life. And this place he found to be among men everywhere.⁶⁸ Only by serving in all the earth would Israel fulfill its divinely appointed mission and point the way to the coming of the day when the knowledge of God would cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Geiger's liberal religious ideas touched and transformed not only the liturgy but colored his interpretation of all the customs, ceremonies and traditions of the Jewish people. A brief consideration of the more important and significant of these will form a fitting close to this paper.

CEREMONIES: On the subject of the observance of ceremonies in general Geiger was in no wise radical. He believed in the necessity of ceremonies to express the spirit of religion but he insisted that such ceremonies must be vitally significant and not mere survivals from a dead past. Ceremonies which were mere forms and no longer strengthened the religious sentiment or ceremonies which represented outgrown religious ideas, must be abandoned and replaced by other ceremonies which expressed the latter day religious consciousness. In a striking essay, published in 1839 on the subject "Der Formglaube in Seinem Unwerthe und in seinen Folgen"⁶⁹ he set forth clearly his ideas on the subject. In this essay he wrote as follows: "Judaism looks upon religious ceremonies as the means for strengthening our religio-ethical sentiments. These ceremonies serve as reminiscences of past events whereby we think of God's paternal and wise overruling Providence or are humbled; they serve also to strengthen our good intentions or to preserve or regain our spiritual purity. Their validity therefore continues only so long as they have this living power; this is possible only if they meet local conditions and conform to

⁶⁸May it (Israel) recognize its high mission among men, to carry Thy name as a holy banner throughout the ages, to proclaim Thy unity, to prepare the true kingdom of God. (Prayer Book 51, Breslau, 1854).

⁶⁹*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, IV., 1-12; See also his comprehensive review of Brück's *Rabbinische Ceremonialgebräuche*. Ibid., III., 413-28.

the stage of contemporary culture. When, however, ceremonies no longer possess the power to fulfill this purpose and are still retained, yes, when they are observed for their own sake and are no longer looked upon simply as means for the expression of the religious spirit, then they become entirely worthless; under such conditions we find that bare formalism has taken the place of free moral activity and the reign of superstition has been inaugurated." In other words, Geiger did not object to ceremonies in religion but to ceremonialism, the perfunctory observance of ceremonies which had ceased to have any meaning for his generation. Thus in a letter to Zunz who had published an ingenuous argument for the retention of the ceremony of the laying of the phylacteries Geiger expressed his surprise at Zunz's casuistical attempt. Geiger asked pointedly whether Zunz really believed that the ceremony of laying the *tefillin* which had its origin in the superstitious belief in the efficacy of amulets, could be fruitful of spiritual good for a generation to whose cultural and aesthetic point of view this was entirely foreign. True, every ceremony can be given a deeper significance. That at some time or other every ceremony had a living significance is also true; but the dead remains dead, the spirit which was in it aforesaid continues in another manner and works in other forms; but the effort to resurrect the dead is vain and even were it successful it would only produce results which would kill all spiritual and moral life.⁷⁰ Geiger had many a controversy with Zunz in this field. Zunz who had begun as a reformer became as years passed a defender of the traditional *status quo*; all the traditional ceremonies found in him an ardent and a learned defender; Judaism for him was simply a traditional system of forms and ceremonies without any spiritual message for the present; he held that the past is of value because it is past, the old because it is old. With all his vast learning Zunz could not appreciate nor understand the currents of living religious endeavor; Geiger's point of view was antipodal to Zunz's and in the attitude of these two men towards the ceremonial legislation we have the sharply defined contrast between the position of the religious reformer and the unprogressive traditionalist. A phrase that

⁷⁰*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V., 181.

Geiger used in another letter to Zunz may be cited as particularly expressive of this antagonism: "The old is not always living and belongs rather in an archaeological museum than in a nursery."⁷¹

THE SABBATH. One of the most vexing problems of modern Jewish life is that of Sabbath observance. Owing to economic conditions the Jews in the modern world find it very difficult if not impossible to observe the seventh day Sabbath as a day of rest and consecration. How to meet this perplexing situation has been the subject of earnest thought and effort of Jewish leaders from the time that it became acute. At the Brunswick rabbinical conference in 1844, the subject was brought up towards the close of the sessions; a committee was appointed to report on the question "Whether there were any means and if so, what, to reconcile Jewish doctrines with the demands of modern life in reference to the Sabbath." Geiger was a member of this committee. The report of the Committee was not acted upon until the Breslau Conference in 1846. Before this Conference met Geiger published a preliminary notice in which he set forth the work the conference would have to do.⁷² He wrote concerning the Sabbath question as follows: "This question must be decided if Judaism is to exist on as a lasting influence and it will be decided if it is kept constantly on the tapis; it must be decided some one way or another by a ripe resolution of the community. One of the most essential institutions of Judaism is the day of consecration and rest, and with this Judaism itself must be rescued from the unspeakable confusion and haziness in whose maw the whole religious life is in danger of being swallowed; rescue from this confusion will ensue only when it is exposed vividly in its imperfection and emptiness."

The discussions on the Sabbath question occupied the greater portion of the sessions of the Breslau Conference. The committee that had been appointed to draw up the report consisted of Rabbis Geiger, S. Adler, A. Adler, Wechsler and Kahn. The report that they presented was not unanimous. The majority report presented by

⁷¹*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V., 185.

⁷²*Die dritte Versammlung deutscher Rabbinen Ein Vorläufiges Wort zur Verstandigung.*

Geiger, Wechsler and A. Adler set forth that the essential idea of the Sabbath is consecration of the day rather than complete absolute rest. This in fact was the sharpest point of distinction among the members of the conference as appeared in the full and lengthy discussions. At the close of the entire discussion Geiger who was the president of the Conference stated that something must be done to preserve the Sabbath and that the Committee's suggestions were made with that end in view, but he confessed that they could suggest no satisfactory remedy that would remove completely the collision between life and Sabbath observance.⁷⁸

The outcome of the discussion of the Breslau Conference was extremely unsatisfactory. Holdheim had declared himself unequivocally for a transfer of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. He regarded the Sabbath as an *אור*, a symbol; it was therefore not the day that was significant but the idea and the idea could find realization on any day. Geiger declared flatly in contradiction to Holdheim, that the Bible does not consider the Sabbath a symbol. None others of the rabbis present at Breslau with the exception of M. Hess was prepared to follow Holdheim in his radical program. But they had no other solution to offer for the difficulties involved in the situation. The resolutions finally adopted fell lamentably short of meeting the issue. The Conference was voted on all sides a failure in its treatment of the Sabbath problem. Geiger himself who as president of the Conference considered it incumbent upon himself to place the work of the Conference before the public in the best light possible, still felt constrained to write these words: "I am frank to confess that the results achieved by the Conference towards a solution of the Sabbath problem are small in comparison with the collisions between Sabbath observance and life."⁷⁹

Throughout all his life Geiger felt that this conflict was one of the most serious ills in modern Jewish life, yes, that in some measure it might be considered a very canker eating into

⁷⁸*Protokolle der dritten Versammlung deutscher Rabbiner*, 160.

⁷⁹*Die dritte Rabbinerversammlung; ein vorläufiges Wort zur Verständigung*, 4.

the vitals of Judaism. He was very impatient with those who considered the Sabbath question simply from the standpoint of Talmudical casuistry; he felt that the Talmudical legislation for the Sabbath was outgrown; the issue involved was the very existence of the Sabbath as a day of consecration and rest; no pilpulistic casuistics availed; the situation now is altogether different from what it was when the Talmudical ideas of Sabbath observance were evolved. At the Augsburg Synod in 1871, he expressed himself very clearly on the subject when he said "The whole method and manner in which Sabbath observance has been developed during the past fifteen hundred years is clearly and decidedly contradictory of the true idea of the Sabbath; the scrupulous prohibition of a hundred and one tasks, the forced externalism—this is no longer the significance of the Sabbath. The significance of the Sabbath lies in the composure of the spirit and of our whole nature. We must have this constantly in view and this can not be achieved by paragraphs nor by combinations and comparisons of passages from the writings of the casuists * * *

Let us leave this alone, if we have not the courage to throw the whole casuistical legislation overboard. That indeed were the best thing to do. But let us approach only the question before us and express ourselves briefly and simply. This is very clear; if it has become evident that riding on the Sabbath will enable many to attend divine services who would be prevented otherwise, it may be taken for granted that this will be decided in the affirmative by an almost unanimous vote. But it is impossible to discuss the various minutiae of this and similar questions; viz.: what the old teachers taught—men, it is true, of the deepest insight; men whose memory we revere, but who lived in their age and not in ours; in an age of altogether different views, circumstances and conditions. Let us be concerned, then, not with this in our decisions of the points before us, but with the idea of the Sabbath, with the needs of our age."

Always the same clear note, always the same unconfused thought. He recognized the difficulties but even he, the finest mind among Jewish leaders could find no all satisfying solution. He was firmly convinced that the seventh day Sabbath is the Sabbath of Juda-

ism. When the Berlin Reform Congregation, which had transferred the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, desired him to accept the position of rabbi of the congregation after Holdheim's death in 1860, one of the reasons why he refused was that he would not abrogate the Sabbath.⁷⁶ However, this did not necessitate to his mind opposition to a supplementary service on Sunday for the benefit of such as could not attend on the Sabbath. In 1846 after the Breslau conference had adjourned he touched this subject in his defense of the Conference. He said that the Conference could not possibly suggest the transfer to Sunday; an institution of Judaism that has existed for thousands of years and is one of its very fundamentals can not be legislated out of existence * * * As for a service on Sunday there can certainly be no objection to a supplemental service so long as it is not a Sabbath service, and any congregation can institute it; but many fear that it is only the opening wedge to a complete transfer. The Conference although asked to pronounce upon the permissibility of a service on Sunday for the benefit of such as do not attend on Saturday postponed consideration of the question, but it is only postponed; the Conference will have to take it up next year or some other time.

This prophecy failed of fulfilment because the Breslau Conference proved to be the last of these meetings; Geiger himself however fifteen years later again gave expression to this possible solution of the difficulties presented by the modern situation when in a brochure already referred to⁷⁶ after referring to the institution of a service on Mondays and Thursdays in ancient days for the benefit of those who could not attend on Sabbath he wrote: "Let us follow this example! We too have a week day which is particularly available for divine service because it is the public day of rest, viz: Sunday. Let us use it for this purpose, if not regularly every week, then from time to time. An impressive Sunday

⁷⁶Ich sagte ihnen dass heute nicht annehmen werde was ich vor vierzehn Jahren abgelehnt, dass ich den Sabbath nicht abrogire, etc. Letter to Wechsler Sept. 6, 1860 in *Nachgelassene Schriften*. V., 247.

⁷⁶*Nothwendigkeit und Maass einer Reform des Jüdischen Gottesdienstes, Nachgelassene Schriften*, I., 226.

service held, let us say, once every four weeks will accomplish the purpose of giving a great portion of the congregation the opportunity of worshipping together without encroaching in any way upon the rights of the Sabbath * * * You make the Sabbath a work day, the Sunday a day of recreation, but must our religion give way to the claims of the present age on the former day and to the adherence to the past on the latter? This is self-deception by which the religious life will be totally extinguished."

CIRCUMCISION: In other phases of practical activity Geiger frequently found that he could not carry out his reformatory ideas. Thus while he looked upon circumcision as a "barbarous bloody act"⁷⁷ still he did not succeed in displacing it as the act of initiation into the covenant. In a letter written to Wechsler in 1849 he stated that he felt that a new form of initiation into Judaism must be found which would replace circumcision. "Blessing the mother does not appear sufficient, the child also should be present (in the synagogue); the reform might be inaugurated with the girls; thus gradually the new form would displace circumcision as confirmation is displacing the *Bar Mizwah*.⁷⁸

THE STATUS OF WOMAN. The *Bar Mizwah* ceremony representing on the one hand the Oriental conception of woman's inferiority and on the other hand embodying the traditional rabbinical view of Judaism as a system of *mitzwot* the observance of which became incumbent upon the male with the attainment of the age of religious majority was recognized in the early days of the reform movement as one of these ceremonies which gave point to the contention of the reformers that when a ceremony was merely a lifeless survival it could be removed none too soon and replaced by another ceremony that should be expressive of the new point of view. Therefore the confirmation ceremony for boys and girls was introduced; this ceremony expressed among other things the reform view of woman's religious equality with man. This vindication of woman's religious rights is one of the marked achievements of the reform movement. Geiger was the first public champion of the religious emancipation of the Jewish woman. In 1837 he published his famous essay en-

⁷⁷*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V., 181. (Letter to Zunz, 1845.)

⁷⁸*Nachgelassene Schriften*, V., 202-3.

titled "*Die Stellung des Weiblichen Geschlechtes in dem Judenthume unserer Zeit.*" This was a stirring plea for woman's religious equality and closed with the eloquent words "Let there be from now on no distinction between duties for men and women unless flowing from the natural laws governing the sexes; no assumption of the spiritual minority of woman as though she were incapable of grasping the deep things in religion; no institution of the public service, either in form or in content, which shuts the door of the temple in the face of woman; no degradation of the woman in the form of the marriage service, and no applying of fetters which may destroy woman's happiness. Then will also the Jewish girl and the Jewish woman, conscious of the significance of the faith, become fervently attached to it, and our whole religious life will profit from the beneficial influence which feminine hearts know how to bestow on it."⁷⁹

In accordance with this view of woman's religious emancipation was Geiger's suggestion of a change in the traditional marriage ceremony. He was chairman of the committee on Marriage Reforms at the Augsburg Synod. The Committee suggested that the Synod declare it to be permissible for the bride to place a ring on the bridegroom's finger with some appropriate words after the groom placed the ring on the bride's finger with the traditional formula, **הרי את מקדשת לי** Geiger in the pursuant discussion after suggesting that the bride use the phrase **אני לרודי ורודי לי** (I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine) gave the reason for this recommendation of the Committee when he said: "The old judicial view according to which woman was a chattel that the man acquired, has disappeared entirely from among us. We do not wish to retain any form whatsoever which was symbolical of this view in earlier days. This is the significance of the resolution that two rings be used in the ceremony in order that it may become known thereby that the man and the woman marry one another, as responsible moral personalities; or if only one ring be used, Judaism protests decidedly against the imputation that an old Oriental view still holds in its

⁷⁹*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, III., 1-14. In his prayer book Geiger omitted the benediction **ברוך אתה יי... שלא עשני אשה** Praised be Thou, O Lord our Lord, Ruler of the Universe. Who has not made me a woman."

midst whereby the worth and dignity of woman are discriminated against legally in any way, even though this was not the case in life."

MARRIAGE LAWS. When the Leipzig Synod convened Geiger as stated above presented a number of subjects whereon he felt some action should be taken. Among these was the reform of the marriage laws. The Leipzig Synod appointed a committee to report on these reforms; this committee reported at the Augsburg Synod which passed a number of resolutions reforming the rabbinical marriage legislation.⁸⁰ These resolutions were in a line with the suggestion of Geiger. He advocated the abolition of the *chalitza* ceremony. He desired also reforms in the divorce legislation in accordance with the following suggestions; a divorce according to rabbinical law should be given as a matter of course if the civil courts have granted a decree of divorce; the marriage of a divorced woman to a so-called *Kohen* or Aaronide should be permitted; all restrictions of the rabbinical law touching the marriage of the *Kohen* should be abolished; particularly should his marriage with a proselyte be permitted.

Here as elsewhere Geiger held that the rabbinical legislation must be changed or abolished in order to conform to the changed conditions in the life and outlook of the Jew in modern society. The rabbinical legislation as codified in the *Schulchan Aruk* was fitted to conditions in Jewish life which were no longer existent in the lands in which the Jews had been emancipated and had become occidentalized. The Jewish reform movement in which Geiger played so prominent a part and the intent of which he so clearly understood is part and parcel of that great religious current which has been sweeping mankind forward since the beginning of the modern age. The Jew lives in the modern world, not apart from it; the separatism of mediæval ghettoism and rabbinism has yielded to the participation in the culture and interests of the society in which he lives and whereof he forms a part. Here the strength of Judaism must find its supreme test. If this religion requires the ghetto, be it local or national, be it Russian Pole or Palestinian state, or in other words a separatist existence away from the non-Jewish surroundings to develop its highest possibilities it has no world mission. The reform movement denies this and declares that Judaism fulfills its highest reach by

⁸⁰Philipson *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, 436-446.

witnessing among men everywhere to the truth of God as declared by Moses and the prophets and developed through ages of endeavor and suffering by their followers. Such was the teaching and the faith of Abraham Geiger; his was the unshaken conviction that Judaism's greatest opportunity lies in its work among men in all parts of the world; the dispersion of the Jews was providential; the emancipation of the latter days was the beginning of new service in the cause of the highest truth; "Judaism requires only the liberating breath in order to be rejuvenated from within," he once declared; and this rejuvenation, this regeneration of the ancient faith was the burden of his thought; he was a modern prophet of Jewish universalism, a spiritual descendant of that ancient seer who pointed with undimmed vision to the coming of the day when "God will be One and His Name One."

F

THE REFORM MOVEMENT AFTER ABRAHAM GEIGER.

DR. MAX LANDSBERG, Rochester, N. Y.

When I accepted the charge of treating the Reform Movement after Geiger's death, I was not unaware of the difficulties of the undertaking. It is a very difficult and thankless task to give an impartial account of a development in whose midst we are standing, and in which we ourselves have taken an active part. It is especially hard when we are disappointed with existing conditions and mournfully see that the beautiful prospects with which we set out in our labors with youthful hope and enthusiasm are far from being realized. This is certainly the unanimous opinion of those who directly or indirectly are the disciples of Abraham Geiger and do their work under his inspiration.

If of any historical development, the words of the German poet, applied to the hero of his greatest tragedy, are true to-day of the Reform Movement in Judaism:

"Von der Partein Hass und Gunst verwirrt
Schwankt sein Characterbild in der Geschirhte."
("As party hate or favor sway the scale,
In history its reputation wavers.")

Besides, Dr. David Philipson in his excellent book—"The Reform Movement in Judaism"—has given an exhaustive historical review of Jewish Reform in the United States and its recent developments in Europe, which carries the account practically to the present day, and gives evidences of the unsatisfactory condition of the Reform Movement in the different European countries.

The great importance of Geiger's work for Reform Judaism consists in this, that unlike many others, the inducement for his studies was not in the first place the desire to introduce reforms

in the practice of the Jewish Religion, but to arrive at the truth regarding its origin and development, and the manner in which the Biblical and post-biblical literature came into existence. His insight was so keen, his judgment so acute, his conclusions so logical, and his results so evident, that for a while even conservatives, like Rappaport and Frankel, followed his lead, until they saw whither the literary and historical investigation led them. The practical results had not been anticipated, there was no dogmatic,—predetermined view, no goal fixed in advance. It was for this reason, that through Geiger the principles of Reform Judaism received so firm a foundation. The results in detail may still have remained subject to difference of opinion; the method, purely scientific, was fixed once for all—as in the doctrine of evolution and the science of Biblical Criticism.

Certain principles of Reform Judaism have been thus firmly established. Revelation is no more a supernatural process, it does not flash up like lightning in dense darkness and presents religion to man all at once in perfect condition; but it is a continuous process of unfolding, of expressing the thought by the national genius, as represented by, and finding its supreme development in, the energy and vision of the prophets. So he showed that Judaism was not brought into existence by the Bible, but that the Bible was produced by Judaism.

The same is true of the further development. Tradition began to be understood as it has found its expression in the Talmud. Here Judaism is represented as nationalistic, and the whole legislation elaborated to keep the Jewish people distinct and separated from all others, so that at a moment's notice it may be prepared to return to Palestine. Geiger's conception and that of those who followed his lead is diametrically opposed to this idea of a mere suspension of the nationality. Therefore, on the hand of the study of comparative religion, it finds Judaism's originality not in those oriental forms and peculiar laws and ceremonies, but in the ethical monotheism of the prophets, and recognizes that all religious forms and ceremonies are changeable in accordance with the condition of the times. And Israel's destiny was to prepare and be prepared—not for the rejuvenation of its separate

nationality, but for a new world which is all embracing; for a time when the religion of ethical monotheism taught by the Hebrew prophets, will be the religion of the whole human race. It is but natural, that, where the ambition is so high, the aspirations so lofty, the reality remains far behind the ideals.

In 1835, in his "Wissenschaftliche Zeitchrift," Geiger complained about the disheartening conditions in an article entitled "Hypocrisy the first demand on the young Rabbis of our time," and 27 years later he criticised in his *Juedische Zeitschrift* with bitter sarcasm the report of the first examination of graduates at the Breslau Seminary, and bewailed a system according to which the attached lungs and the skinned birds' foot still remained the Rabbi's principal concern, while the burning questions which cry for solution at the present time were inexcusably and shamefully neglected. All his lifetime he was chafing under the distressing results of this reactionary system, and whenever one of the stalwart fighters who had been his co-workers entered upon his eternal reward, he complained that there were lacking the successors to take up their labors in the direction of progress and healthy development among the young Rabbis and Jewish scholars. Geiger's motto: "In der Vergangenheit forschen, In der Gegenwart leben, Fuer die Zukumft bauen"

("To search in the past, to live in the present, to build for the future.")

was lost sight of, and the whole energy was spent in the reactionary work of galvanizing into apparent life the observances of old, which had outlived their usefulness and in which intelligent Jews took not the slightest interest. To this day in the vestibule of the magnificent New Synagogue at Berlin you find posted announcements of the butchers for whom alone the Rabbinate of Berlin assumes the responsibility.

After the Synods of Leipzig in 1869 and Augsburg, 1871, which under the inspiration of Geiger took some steps in the direction of practical reform, no more such gatherings were convened, and when 5,800 members of the Jewish congregation in Berlin petitioned for supplementary Sunday services, the Berlin Rabbis unconditionally objected. The petition was rejected, and, instead

of gratifying the wishes of so large a constituency, the authorities offered in its place what nobody wanted, the introduction of a sermon on Friday night. The Rabbinical Association of Germany simply declared, that a supplementary Sunday service could not even be discussed by them, and all their energy was exhausted in the consideration of the propriety of holding two services on Friday night in the winter time, one at the time of sunset, when the Sabbath begins, and one later in the evening, when it was possible for the people to attend; and even this second service was claimed by some to be objectionable, because it would detract from the attendance on Saturday morning, and the President referred to Sunday Services in America as "arousing indignation against those who dare attack the foundation of our religion." It is no wonder that Dr. B. Kellerman in his remarkable Lecture, "Liberales Judenthum," delivered in 1907 in the "Liberale Verein fuer die Angelegenheiten der Juedischen Gemeinde" could make the statement that since the death of Abraham Geiger Judaism in Germany had experienced not only no further development, but a backward movement.

But the wheels of progress can not be stopped, however many may try to put on the brakes. The spirit of Geiger, so long latent could not forever be suppressed. It was inherited by those who had a conception of historical continuity and recognized, that "Judaism was at all times a religion of the deed and of life" (Geig. Judenth, und seine Geschichte, III, 156) "who do not always want something that is perfect," and understood, that "what is old and venerable is not always alive, and belongs rather into an archeological museum, than into a nursery." Ges. W. V. 186), and that "no attempted patchwork will ever avail." (ib. 189.)

New life began to be infused into the dry bones by the foundation of the Society for liberal Judaism in Germany, May 3, 1908, by 201 men, amongst whom were the Rabbis Drs. C. Seligman, H. Vogelstein and Freudenthal. Vogelstein declared, "the future of reform is the future of Judaism," and Seligman, "The domestic religion must be transformed; religious instruction must not force upon the pupils a dogma which is in conflict with the assured results of science. The science of Judaism must be cultivated

with especial love, to form the foundation for the establishment of Jewish religious sentiment." The fundamental principle expressed in the platform was "the Jewish Religion is capable of constant and indefinite development."

After six months the Society counted 4000 members, who will be the leaven to set the whole inert mass into motion and produce new and fresh life.

In France, as soon as the total separation of Church and State had become a reality, and the incubus of State supervision and subvention had been lifted from the Jewish religious organizations in 1907, the spirit of reform awoke to an activity unheard of there before, and in the same year the "Union Libérale Israelite" was founded in Paris, which received enthusiastic support and found a competent Rabbi and spokesman in Dr. Louis-Germain Levi, who well says of reform Judaism, the religion of the prophets, "*Le Judaïsme n'est pas une religion parmi tant d'autres mais la religion,*" (Judaism is not *a* religion among many others, but *the* religion.), and gives this admirable statement of his position showing the most perfect comprehension of reform Judaism: "The Judaism, as we French Jews of the twentieth century understand it, is not only not in conflict with the legitimate demands of the modern conscience, but agrees with them in the most satisfactory manner. It is a religion without mysteries, without a revealed dogma, without an official theology, without priests, hostile to all superstition, thirsting for clear knowledge, admitting no other criterion of truth than the light of truth itself. Judaism applauds the work of science and accepts its established results. Thus it is a religion of free investigation and untrammelled speculation, *recommending* without doubt particularly certain creeds, but not *imposing* them dictatorially, proposing them to the consent of personal effort. It is therefore a religion of individual initiative and responsibility, a religion which moulds the character, a religion essentially ethical, preaching the good on account of its real beauty, without the element of fear or ulterior motives, not encouraging a lazy, contemplative and ascetic piety, striving after the intimate fusion of individual and social welfare, aiming at the realization of the ideals of justice and universal peace. It is

a religion indefinitely perfectible because it is open to the progressively accumulated acquisitions of thinkers and scientists, because it allows to reason the last word, and admits the criticism of its traditions and institutions, and must therefore be willing to cast off antiquated practices and clothe itself with new forms adapted to new conditions." He has great hopes for the future and cries out with the voice of a prophet, "Israel which formerly nestled with the eagles seems to have forgotten the paths of heaven. It seems time that it should awaken from its slumber, which, if prolonged, would end in death. It seems time, that, once more moved by the prophetic frenzy, it should shake off from its wings the dust of centuries, and, resuming its flight, soar up to the realms of clear brightness, and bring to humanity the message of light and salvation."

Even in conservative England a new breath of life is stirring the dry bones through the admirable efforts of Mr. Claude G. Montefiore and Mr. Oswald J. Simon, and the movement, known as "the Jewish Religious Union," promising a rejuvenation of Judaism in that country, was inaugurated against the violent opposition of the representatives of "official Judaism." The hysterical aggression against it by the opponents, backed by State Establishment is the best proof of its strength and an earnest of its future growth.

But it is in the United States that Reform Judaism had untrammelled sphere of development, and in the last fifty years has manifested real life. Energetic activity and outspoken demand of practical reform upon the foundation of scientific investigation, found little or no response in Germany, and it was providential that the early co-laborers of Abraham Geiger were transplanted to the virgin soil of America, where no state laws interfered with religious organization, and where ample scope was given to free development and the reconciliation of the spirit and the forms of religion with modern life. Adler and Einhorn and Hirsch formulated here the aspects of Reform Judaism, and, assisted by that magnificent organizer Isaac M. Wise, established it on a firm and unshakable foundation.

Geiger recognized this and repeatedly expressed himself, that

America was the promised land for Judaism. Forty years ago, in 1870, he induced the writer of this paper to accept the position then offered him, which he still holds to-day; and when he was reluctant to follow the advice, Geiger said, "If I were twenty years younger I would myself go to America."

Dr. Wise's labors for Reform Judaism culminated in the foundation of a seat of learning with outspoken liberal tendencies, and when the Cincinnati College Building was dedicated in 1881, the College was greeted in Germany as "an institution which proclaims the true mission of Judaism, a mission that consists not in strengthening nationalistic particularism, but in emphasizing those great ideas that bind the nations together." Dr. Wise, in his Dedicatory address, stated the fundamental principle of the religion taught at the college in these words, "The Jews are neither a race nor a nation; they are a religious denomination. * * * When one ceases to be a Jew by religion, after a few generations he loses all his other characteristics," (meaning thereby the peculiarities generally ascribed to the Jews as racial.) Un. Am. Congr. reports Vol. II, p. 1087. In 1886 the Rabbinical Conference at Pittsburg over which Dr. Wise presided, made the most radical declaration of principles of Reform Judaism, to which the venerable rabbi adhered to the end of his life.

In the year 1889, at Detroit he organized the Central Conference of Am. Rabbis which held its first annual session at Cleveland in 1890, and of which he remained the beloved president, full of youthful energy and initiative, until his death. At the seventh annual conference at Montreal in 1897, Dr. Wise in his address as president emphatically denounced the agitation of Zionism which had then commenced by those "who revive among certain classes of our people the political national sentiment of olden times, and turn the mission of Israel from the province of religion and humanity to the narrow political and national field, where Judaism loses its universal and sanctified ground and its historical signification." He further said, that "as reported by the press, so and so many Rabbis (of America) advocated those political schemes, and compromised in the eyes of the public, the whole American Judaism as the phantastic dupes of a thoughtless

Utopia, which is to us a *fata morgana*, a momentary inebriation of morbid minds, and a prostitution of Israel's holy cause to a madman's dance of unsound politicians. . . . the honor and position of the American Israel demand imperatively that this conference which represents the sentiment of American Judaism minus the idiosyncrasies of the late immigrants . . . do declare officially the American standpoint in this unpleasant episode of our history." (Year book of Central Conf. for 1897, p. 40-41.)

The rejection of the nationalistic idea being recognized as the fundamental principle of Reform Judaism, which found emphatic expression in all Reform Rituals and in the Union Prayer Book, published by the Conference: the following resolution was adopted without a dissenting voice.

"Resolved, that we totally disapprove of any attempt for the establishment of a Jewish State. Such an attempt shows a misunderstanding of Israel's mission, which from the narrow political and national field has been expanded to the promotion among the whole human race of the broad and universalistic religion first proclaimed by the Jewish prophets. Such attempts do not benefit but infinitely harm our Jewish brethren where they are still persecuted, by confirming the assertion of their enemies that the Jews are foreigners in the countries where they are at home, and of which they are everywhere the most loyal and patriotic citizens."

"We re-affirm that the object of Judaism is not political nor national but spiritual, and addresses itself to the continuous growth of peace, justice and love in the human race to a time, when all men will recognize that they form one great brotherhood for the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth."*

The assertions rejecting nationalism are simply reiterations of all former platforms of Reform Judaism and of the declaration at Pittsburg in 1885, "We consider ourselves no longer a nation,

*The Reform principle in Judaism was well recognized by the great Norwegian poet, Byoernson, who said, "The Jewish people, the nobility of the human race, would have been long annihilated, if it had been obliged to carry the load of a state in Palestine." From the abolition of the national existence he explains the possibility of the continued existence of the Jews to the end of time.

but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish State."

We hear and read in Jewish papers now a great deal about the pretended bankruptcy of Reform Judaism, and of the necessity and the beginning of what they call a counter reformation. These manifestations must not scare us. It is an old experience that those who oppose progress and wish to stand pat always talk the loudest. Indeed, consciously or unconsciously, the leaning toward Zionism, diametrically opposed to the Reform principle, is at the foundation of the dissatisfaction.

We have a large number of Rabbis and Reform Synagogues in America by whom that principle is fully understood, where the scientifically assured results of criticism of Bible and tradition are openly assumed and generally accepted, where no offence is given in speaking of the legends of the Bible, and the children are taught in their religious lessons on critical lines, and where the motto is "*Not backward but forward.*"

The wings of the morning are stirring the purified air in our country and in Europe. Here and there the fathers who laid the foundations have found many trusty disciples who follow in their wake and continue their work in their spirit.

Though there is still much that is disheartening, especially great indifferentism to religion—by no means confined to the Jewish community—we need not despair. All that is necessary is, not to lose courage but to continue building on the established foundations, to strengthen them with sound scholarship, to draw the practical conclusions, and to announce them fearlessly to the world. Then we may be sure that our visions of the coming dawn will not be disappointed and our honest work will be crowned with glorious success.

F

(APPENDIX.)

THE REFORM MOVEMENT AFTER ABRAHAM GEIGER.

DISCUSSION LED BY RABBI A. GUTTMACHER, Baltimore, Md.

The Centenary year of the birth of Abraham Geiger has stimulated interest in that phase of Judaism, which bears the spiritual impress of the genius of Geiger. All those who view Reform as the logical and inevitable result of historic development, have proclaimed anew in this centenary year their allegiance to the basic principles of Reform Judaism, as formulated by Geiger. We are far enough removed from the time in which Geiger labored, to estimate, without passion and prejudice, the enduring elements of his contributions toward the Reform movement in Judaism. Time has proven that the ideals and aspirations Geiger preached, and voiced in his writings, were not the chimeras of an impulsive and novelty seeking mind, but that they were inspired by the careful study and searching of the source of Judaism by one who was possessed of the modesty of the true student. Not only did the Prophets find in Geiger a devoted disciple, but, with the keen insight of the historian, he discerned in the writings of the Tannaim and Amoraim, as well as in the works of the philosophers and poets of a later age, those elements which added to the spiritual growth and upbuilding of Judaism. Whatever form Judaism may take, in the course of the ages, Reform Judaism, as conceived and interpreted by Geiger, the theologian and historian, will ever mark one of the most luminous landmarks on Judaism's onward march toward universal religion.

The paper I have been asked to discuss, covers the period of the Reform movement after Geiger. The essayist states at the outset the difficulty of the task to portray conditions in the midst of which he lives and toils. We readily appreciate his position. The trend and tendencies of a period, do not, as a rule, leave the self-same im-

pression upon all observers, the personal equation does unconsciously enter into the reading and interpretation of the various signs and symptoms. The writer of the paper takes a rather gloomy view of the period he describes. However objectively we may regard the Reform movement that fact remains, that, though we are living in an age especially hospitable to ideas of reform in all lines of human endeavor, reform ideas in Judaism have failed to enlist the interest of the many. Reform has not succeeded to make Judaism an essential factor in the daily life of the modern Jew. In Germany, the home of Reform, as well as in other lands where the movement has been inaugurated, Judaism is far from being in a healthy condition.

In Germany, when the waves of anti-semitism rose higher and higher toward the eighties of the last century, Judaism among the educated Jews became a negligible quantity. Conversion to Christianity, as in the generation which followed Mendelssohn, increased in number from week to week. Orthodoxy inured to a *laisson-faire* policy, was unable to stem the tide of conversion, and Reform Judaism lacked organization and constructive leadership to keep within the fold those who were straying away from the faith of their fathers. As it was to be expected, Reform was blamed by the opponents for having brought on the wholesale apostasy. Had Geiger lived ten more years, and continued teaching at the Berliner Hochschule, the cause of reform would have been better understood, and appreciated, and established on a firmer basis in Germany. Anti-Semitism might have never taken such deep root, had it in the beginning been opposed by the organized and well directed efforts of the educated German Jews.

I need not state here, that the enthusiasm of the early German Reformers caused little response in the hearts of the Jewish people. A new world was preparing, and non-Jews and Jews alike yielded themselves up to the fresh inspiration of the time, and permitted themselves to be carried along by the universal transforming movement, the great political and economic problems of the new age were pressing for solution, and the best minds were everywhere absorbed in adopting the old to the new. Religion alone kept to the old, however obsolete, indifferent to the vast changes which enlight-

enment had wrought in all the great moral and intellectual affairs of mankind.

The Synods at Leipzig and Augsburg were attended by men prominent in the various walks of life, and in sympathy with the liberal movement. Prof. M. Lazarus, who presided over both Synods, in closing the Synod at Leipzig, states the purpose of the gathering "Meine Herren, abschaffen wollen wir freilich, abschaffen wollen wir vor allem den Indifferentismus; abschaffen wollen wir die Ignoravoz. Damit allein ist es nicht gethan, wir beduerfen auch der Reform. Wir ehren das alte! Die wahrhafte Ehra desselben ist aber, dast wir es pflegen, nicht dass wir es verkommen lassen."

In England, "the West-End Synagogue of British Jews" was established as the first Reform Congregation in 1842. Later similar congregations were organized in Manchester and Bradford. But, here too, Reform languished, owing to lack of initiative on the part of the leaders, and the lack of an active propaganda. Paul Goodman, speaking of Reform Judaism in England, touches upon this very point. "These Congregations," referring to the three Reform Congregations, "are going the even tenor of their ways and have no ambition to extend their influence; almost from the time of their establishment they have stopped short on the path of reform."

In America, owing to the peculiar characteristics of a heterogeneous Jewish population, the task of Einhorn and Wise, the great protagonists of Reform was especially a different one. And yet, Reform grew in strength, from decade to decade, and has always shown here more vitality than anywhere else.

The spread of the Reform idea in America was largely due to the blessed activity of the founder of this Conference—Isaac M. Wise. Wise was a builder. With singleness of purpose, with undaunted energy and enthusiasm, with keen foresight, he understood how to fashion conditions and make them the vehicle for his reform ideas. Who dare deny that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Hebrew Union College, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, have not been potent factors in the up-building and preservation of Judaism in this country. They were

the first successful efforts to unite, rather than divide, the spiritual and religious forces in American Jewry.

Like other religious faiths, Judaism, too, has suffered from the indifference of her children. Yet, within recent days signs which seem to indicate renewed interest in religion are multiplying. Whether this awakening be due to Anti-Semitism, or Zionism, or to the many fads that go by the name of religion, or whether it be the effect of a rebound from the crass materialism of our age, the activity in the Reform and Orthodox camps causes betokens life. The renaissance of Reform in Germany; the noble and persistent efforts of a handful of men of liberal tendencies in England to combat indifferentism and the beginnings of a liberal movement among the Jews in France, as well as the more positive Reform teachings and preachings in America, all augur a better time for the Reform movement.

In brief, Reform has entered upon a constructive period, full of spirit and energy. There is high time for this awakening. Things religious are in a most unsatisfactory state. Much of the so-called religious unrest, is at bottom nothing else but stolid indifference and intellectual laziness. The Orthodox blame the Reformers for what they call the disintegration of Judaism. The Reformers in turn bring a bill of indictment against the Orthodox charging them with responsibility for the slender hold that Judaism has upon the average Jew. Dr. Cæsar Seligman correctly states that the Orthodox confuse cause and effect. "Not Reform Judaism," he says, is the cause of the disintegration of Judaism, but Reform is the effect of that threatened disintegration. At no time, has Reform endeavored to wean anyone away from Orthodoxy. But its aim has always been to reach those who had broken altogether with Orthodoxy, who are Jews, but in name, and are in danger of losing their religious identity. Just as Karaitism placed Rabbinism upon its mettle, so has Reform stirred Orthodoxy into activity pointing out to it the duties and obligations of Judaism toward the generation of to-day.

Dr. Klein of Stockholm, who had sat at the feet of Geiger in the Berliner Hochschule, in eulogizing his great teacher in a recent address, he said: "Gleich den Propheten hat er uns kein System,

nur ein Program hinterlassen." This, to my mind, accounts for the strength, but also for the weakness of Reform Judaism. True, a system is apt to become in course of years stereotyped, petrified, as for example the Shulchan Aruch. Yet, on the other hand, it might have acted as a restraint and prevented an individualism which oft-time has brought Reform Judaism into disrepute, even with the thinking. In recent years there is a pronounced tendency among Reform Jews to form organizations, which undoubtedly, make for sound conservatism by checking all extreme views. This very Conference, established in 1889, meeting annually, has done much to make the Reform pulpit in this country less radical than it otherwise would have been. The same may be said of the establishment in 1901 in England, of the Jewish Religious Union, and of the Union Libérale Israelite in France in 1907.

The many organizations among the Reform Jews, during the last decade, are especially important for the cause of Reform Judaism. Among these organizations I shall mention but two—The Union of the Liberal Rabbis in 1898, and Die Vereinigung für das liberale Judenthum in 1908. Never before has Reform Judaism in Germany shown such remarkable activity. Thousands who heretofore had stood aloof, show now deep interest in the spread of Reform ideas. Books, pamphlets, periodicals, are published expounding the nature of Reform and its aim. Lecturers are sent by a central bureau to all parts of the country to bring home the message of Reform Judaism to the Jew who had turned his back upon the Synagogue.

Reform has ceased to be negative, to be continually on the defensive. Reform Judaism can point to some solid achievements—a well regulated Divine Service; Sermons delivered in the language of the land; a system of religious training of the child; and the active participation of woman in the broader religious and social life of the community.

Reform Judaism, here and everywhere, must be about and doing. It is engaged in a work which is never fully done. Its aim must be to heal all division and bring about union. Religious indifference must be checked in every possible direction. And it can be

conquered by religious earnestness, by persevering effort, by intellectual honesty, by deeds of self-sacrifice on the part of those who aspire to spiritual leadership. Opinions must give way to convictions, if we wish to impart to others the truths of our faith.



RELIGION AND THE SOCIAL EVIL.

BY HENRY BERKOWITZ, PHILADELPHIA.

When the Conference of Rabbis assembled in the year 135 of the common era, its members met secretly in a garret in some obscure house in the Palestinian town of Lydda. They were in imminent peril of their lives by reason of the cruel persecutions of the Roman Emperor, Hadrian. Rabbi Akiba was the master spirit of the assembly. In the circle sat such eminent rabbis as Tarphon, Joseph the Gallilean, and Ishmael. Theirs was not the composure which attends mere academic discussion. With bated breath they argued the question of life and death which it had fallen to their lot as the responsible leaders of the people to decide: "How far might one go in obedience to Rome, transgressing the Torah in order to save one's life?" The decision was: "To save one's life all laws should be deemed suspended excepting three, viz., those against: עֲבֵרַת אֱלֹהִים נִלְוֵי עֲרִיטָה וּשְׁפִיכוֹת דָּמוֹת (Sanhedrin 74a), i. e., against Idolatry, every form of licentiousness, and murder."

This Conference of Rabbis is happily assembled in a free country where, thank God, there is none to make us afraid, but unhappily our hearts tremble none the less because of the dreadful alternative of death or dishonor to which many of our brothers and sisters are brought in our day. The Hadrianic persecutions have their woful parallel in the terrors that rule in the dominion of Czar Nicholas II of Russia. These have caused that most extraordinary migration of people which has brought a steady stream of wanderers to this land during the past three decades. What wonder a percentage of these pitiable exiles become demoralized! Huddled together as pariahs in the pale of settlement; driven forth into foreign lands as outcasts; beaten about, robbed, scorned and abused as the homeless

are, they come here into our congested cities only to be ground down by the agonies of the Sweating System. What wonder they are dazed and confused by the total transformation demanded for their adjustment to these strange and untried conditions!

We have been shamed and startled by the recent revelation of broken homes. Is it an illusion we have been cherishing in holding fast our faith in the resistless power inherent in the sweet domesticity of the Jewish family? Evils unknown and undreamed of in my boyhood days have of late become increasingly familiar in Jewish annals. Desertions, divorces, clandestine marriages, juvenile delinquency in alarming degree, prostitution and "the White Slave traffic," all these are new and hitherto unknown entries in the calendar of transgressions on the part of Jews. Well then may our hearts tremble and somewhat of the solemn seriousness that rested on the men who assembled at Lydda, now awaken in our souls. As the exigencies of those dreadful Hadrianic times demanded a clear, strong and frank pronouncement from the religious leaders, so upon us is the obligation to face this emergency which is upon us and confer together as to how we may strengthen and restore the moral supports of our people wherever they have been weakened. We may well renew the ordinance of Lydda and its vigorous admonition against those who destroy the very foundations of the moral life itself.

That ordinance epitomizes, as far as Judaism is concerned, the right attitude of Religion towards what is euphemistically called "The Social Evil." It condenses the whole history of our people's struggles against the Oriental vices as revealed in the proscriptions of Leviticus; in the rigid Mosaic legislation against the "abominations of Egypt and the abominations of Canaan; (Leviticus XVIII, Deut. XX-XXIV), and in the bold and fearless denunciations by all the Prophets in turn, of the orgies in which licentious practices were fostered under the sanctions of religion.

For us, that ordinance of the Rabbis of the second century has the added emphasis of nearly eighteen hundred years of history. In that time the purity of the social relations were effectually safeguarded among us amid all the changes and vicissitudes of Mediæval days, by the injunctions and decisions of the successive gener-

ations of the Rabbis. These decisions are summarized in the great Rabbinical Codes. The sexual relations are minutely prescribed with most scrupulous care for health, cleanliness, modesty and decency, and reveal the highest ideals of social purity crystalized into laws. Even lustful desire was condemned as a moral offense, (*Eben Haezer*, Sec. 21). The records of Jewish life everywhere present the evidences of the remarkable fidelity with which these laws were obeyed under the handicap of all manner of harassing repression and restrictions. (*Jewish Life In the Middle Ages*, Israel Abrahams, p. 90 f). It is because of this record, that the accusations against the moral life of some Jews which have filled the newspapers and periodicals within the past year have wounded us severely in our most sacred feelings and in our tenderest susceptibilities.

Allowing for all the exaggerations of cheap Journalism, unfortunately there is a measure of truth in the charges made in such an article as that by Geo. Kibbe Turner in *McClure's Magazine*, Nov., 1909, "The Daughters of the Poor." The American Jewish Committee after having made investigations on this subject, in its statements of February, 1910, "Solemnly declares that whereas, a few sporadic instances of so-called 'White Slavery' among Jews may be found, no such thing as an organized international or national trade in women among Jews can be found." There is evidence to the contrary in the Report of the United States Commission on Immigration presented to Congress by Mr. Dillingham, December 10, 1909. Some degraded Jews have no doubt been found engaged in this bestial business along with others. President Taft called attention to this grave evil in his message to Congress December 7, 1909, in the following words:

"I greatly regret to have to say that the investigations made in the Bureau of Immigration and other sources of information lead to the view that there is urgent necessity for additional legislation and greater executive activity to suppress the recruiting of the ranks of prostitutes from the streams of immigration into this country—an evil which, for want of a better name, has been called 'The White Slave Trade.'

"I believe it to be constitutional to forbid, under penalty, the

transportation of persons for purposes of prostitution across national and state lines; and by appropriating a fund of \$50,000 to be used by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor for the employment of special inspectors it will be possible to bring those responsible for this trade to indictment and conviction under a Federal law."

Bills were introduced into Congress providing rigid legislative remedies. State Legislatures enacted stringent laws such as that admirable measure provided by the State of Illinois against "Pand-erers." (Appendix B.)

Ours is a double interest in this painful matter, that of citizens concerned for the honor of our country and that of Jews concerned for the honor of our faith. Every Jewish organization has been moved to denounce the evil and take steps to overcome it. The Independent Order of *B'nai Brith* has been active in this cause. The Council of Jewish Women has been serving through its agents at the ports, in safe-guarding immigrant girls. The Jewish Immigration Societies in New York, Philadelphia and elsewhere have been exercising every vigilance. In various cities investigations have been conducted by private organizations and by public Grand Juries. A number of trials and convictions have been secured. An International Convention of eminent Jewish Men and Women met in London, April, 1910, and delegates are to present the results of their deliberations at the great International Convention to meet in Milan, August, 1910.

These and other movements indicate how widespread and how profound is the agitation, how quick is the public conscience and how responsive to any appeal in behalf of purity. This reveals the fact that we have now come to a remarkable period in the world's progress along these lines. That progress is definitely set towards the ideal which has been upheld by Israel from its earliest history.

Says a modern authority (Alvin S. Johnson, *Bryn Mawr*, in: *The Social Evil*—Report of Committee of Fifteen on conditions in New York, p. 13).

"Of the ancient nations with the life of which we are best acquainted, the Hebrews alone understood that prostitution is itself a serious evil. The Greeks and Romans saw clearly that certain

evils resulted from it, and it was their constant endeavor to divest it of those attendant evils. The trend of Jewish legislation may accordingly be described as repressive; that of Greece and Rome as regulative."

The example of the Greeks and Romans which has heretofore controlled the Councils and the legislation of the European countries is now yielding to the standpoint consistently maintained by Israel.

Observation has shown that prostitution is practically universal and attended everywhere by the dread scourge of venereal disease. A witty Frenchman has made the epigrammatic comment: "Civilization is Syphilization." The attitude of mind has generally been such as to lead to the despairing conclusion in regard to this vice: "It always has been and it always will be, therefore it is best to tolerate the evil and regulate it." As a result we have the anomalous practice on the part of governments organized to protect society against the vicious and lawless, actually covenanting with vice, licensing it, protecting it, inspecting and regulating it, as in Paris, Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg and most of the European centers of population.

This system is false in theory, and is confessedly breaking down in practice. On the one hand it stimulates clandestine vice to elude police surveillance or to corrupt the latter with graft. It condones and laxity of men by legalizing sexual traffic apart from matrimony. Nay it gives to this practice not merely the encouragement but the very sanction of the law by providing women with clean health records to entice men with the promise of immunity from the dangers of disease attendant on such illicit commerce.

The recital of these facts is enough to excite our detestation of the whole system. It is utterly abhorrent, from every moral point of view. It harasses and hounds the woman while it shields and aids the man. It sets up and maintains a double standard of morals, one for men and quite another for women. Because the woman has been made by the Creator to bear the physical mark of her indulgence, while the man is exempt, is there any justification to let the man go free and to hold the woman, his victim, in contempt, ostracized and doomed to miserable disease and early

death? Therefore even as the Rabbis at Lydda hurled their denunciations at the false system of ancient idolatry, though at the risk of suffering martyrdom, so are we called upon in the name of Judaism to denounce this modern idolatry based upon a false materialistic philosophy of life, which worships pleasure as its God. Out upon the Hedonism which justifies the sons of the rich to despoil the daughters of the poor! In the name of God, let us denounce this apotheosis of animalism, this modern Nature worship. If we profess the Religion of the Prophets, let us kindle our souls at the Divine fires from which they caught the flames of the righteous wrath with which they consumed the idolatry of ancient days.

Religion can not then condone the Social Evil. It repudiates most emphatically that proclamation of despair which avers that the evil is, was and ever will be. The assertion is utterly repulsive to every principle we cherish of the possibilities of manhood and womanhood and a surrender of that cardinal principle of the aspiration of the human towards the divine: "Holy shall ye be for I, the Lord your God, am holy!" (Lev. XIX, 2.)

In the second place, Religion can not condone the social evil because that evil is based on the sacrifice of human life. It has been affirmed that what is best and purest in civilization could not have been achieved but for the sacrifice of a certain number of women to a life of dishonor and inevitably of early decay and death. Lecky (*History of European Morals*, Vol. II, p. 293) has this to say of the Courtesan:—"Herself the supreme type of vice, she is ultimately the most efficient guardian of virtue. But for her, the unchallenged purity of countless happy homes would be polluted, and not a few, who, in the pride of their untempted chastity, think of her with an indignant shudder, would have known the agony of remorse and despair. On that one degraded and ignoble form are concentrated the passions that might have filled the world with shame. She remains while creeds and civilizations rise and fall, the eternal priestess of humanity, blasted for the sins of the people."

Since Lecky wrote this eloquent and pathetic plea about thirty years ago, a total transformation has come in the knowledge of mankind concerning the place of the prostitute as a factor in the

social economy. In antiquity men foraged for women and "The Rape of the Sabines" was a type of the daily occurrence. Captives of war were destined—men to slavery, women to concubinage. In feudal times outlaws and brigands appropriated the women of the vanquished. In modern times the exactions of our industrial system are such and its competitions so intense that many men can not afford to marry or will not surrender their selfish ease for marital joys and responsibilities, while the wages of women are kept so low that thousands of them are forced to sell their honor to eke out a means of existence. (*Mrs. Warren's Profession*, a play by Bernard Shaw.)

According to Blaschko, *Conference Internationale, Brussels, 1899*, statistics of the German industrial centers and those of domestics in St. Petersburg show that in hard times, when work is scarce, women resort to prostitution, which they speedily abandon when employment is found.

These facts as to the coercion of woman by stress of dire necessity, as victims, as captives or as wage-slaves, put in rather a ridiculous light the picture of her offering herself as the priestess of humanity to suffer for the sins of the people. Most absurd, in the light of present day knowledge, is it to picture the prostitute as "the ultimate guardian of virtue," the saviour of the purity of countless happy homes. The fact is that she is the chief destroyer of the home, for she is the purveyor of the vilest contagion that afflicts the human race. As the High Priestess of the social evil she does indeed offer herself as a victim of disease to early death. She communicates to men the infection, which is passed on, often unconsciously, to innocent wives and children, breeding illness, deformity, idiocy and a hundred and one ills whose origin but a few years ago was wrapped in mystery.

The effect of secret vice on physical health is to-day commanding the attention of the public as never before in all history. The ravages of venereal disease are not accurately known for lack of statistical information. Yet within the last twenty years the discoveries made have changed the whole mental attitude of the world on the subject. The hollow calumnies on "the mysterious Dispensations of Divine Providence" are being daily exposed. (Dr. Heff-

ron, *Journal of Religious Education*, February, 1910.) It is now known that 75 per cent. of the male population between 18 and 30 years of age in cities, either are or have been victims of these diseases; 75 per cent. of the surgical operations on female reproductive organs are due to this cause; 25 to 50 per cent. of all blindness is caused by gonorrheal ophthalmia; 50 per cent. of sterility is due to the social evil. Syphilis is the only disease which is known absolutely to be hereditary; 65 to 100 per cent. of syphilitic children die early and miserably. A track of death has been mowed through the world by tuberculosis, but alas, a far wider one is the swath made by syphilis. "The slaughter of the innocents" who are victims of this foul disease goes on apace. Full well do we need to renew the ordinance of the Rabbis at Lydda which denounced murder as a fundamental prohibition. The world is being aroused to a realization of the fact that the Social Evil is the source of fully one-eighth of all human diseases and the cause of more deaths than tuberculosis, typhoid fever, yellow fever, diphtheria and scarlet fever combined. A campaign is being organized to clean out this filth disease of the ages.

An International Convention held in Brussels in 1902 gave the impetus to a world-wide movement. Societies have been organized in Germany with 5,000 members, in France with 1,000 members, also in Holland and other European countries. New York City organized in 1905. Thirteen branches in as many cities and States have already been formed. At the recent meeting of the American Medical Society in St. Louis steps were taken to put the fight against venereal disease on a national basis with an organizing secretary and a popular campaign of education and publicity. This is a movement led by physicians. They are clamoring for the aid of clergymen, and indeed of all men and women who stand for the sacredness and preservation of human life—clean, sane and pure. I am commissioned to make a direct appeal to the members of our Conference in behalf of this cause, and I append to this paper a Bibliography of publications giving all the data. (Appendix A.)

The most important word on "Religion and the Social Evil" remains to be said in this the concluding section of this paper. It

has reference to that fundamental principle proclaimed by the Rabbis at Lydda when they declared that one should die rather than surrender one's purity and sacrifice one's honor. *Gillui Arayoth*—"uncovering the nakedness" is the general Hebrew term for all the crimes of licentiousness down to adultery and incest. It is better to die than commit these.

Our religion has had no room for that asceticism which exalts celibacy to a virtue. But none the less it has strictly enjoined continence in both man and woman by multitudinous regulations of chastity. (See Article *Chastity*; Jewish Encyclopedia.) It is on this subject that our people need a strong pronouncement from us to-day. "A conspiracy of silence" on all sexual questions holds the social and religious world in its meshes. We never read the portions of the Bible, the Commentaries or the Codes that have reference to these vital matters. We rarely, if ever, venture to speak to each other frankly in the home circle; the theme is "taboo" in the pulpit and strictly excluded from the instruction given in our schools. As a result the whole effort at moral education falls short and frequently breaks down at the crucial point. This is due to our prudery, our false shame, our ignorance, our timidity, our hypocrisy and moral cowardice. Parents, teachers and ministers share in the great sin of sending out into the world boys and girls utterly ignorant of the simplest natural facts about the most intimate and sacred of all human concerns. The wonder is not that some of our girls go to ruin and many of our boys become vulgarized—the wonder is that all of them are not debased by the false information they imbibe from ignorant nurses, the filth they absorb from the companions of the street, the lies with which their curiosity is fed and the dangers to which they are exposed from obscene literature and quack doctors. Frank Wedekind has exposed this fatal error in our education in his remarkable drama. "*Frühlings Erwachen*," ("The Awakening of Spring—A Tragedy of Childhood.") It has passed through twenty-six editions in German, and has been issued in every European language. This play has become a factor in the new education. It has become one of the "stock plays" of "Das Neue Theater" in Berlin and has helped on the war-fare against the rooted prejudice of the past generations,

resulting at last in having the physiology of sex properly taught in the German Schools. Francis J. Ziegler in the Introduction to his English translation of this play (Brown Bros., Philadelphia, 1909) says: "The dictum of the Swedish dramatist, August Strindberg, that the playwright should be a lay-priest, preaching on vital topics of the day in a way to make them intelligible to mediocre intellects, is not appreciated in this country as it should be, but once admit the kinship of dramatist and priest, and the position taken by Wedekind in writing 'Fruehlings Erwachen' becomes self-evident."

To expose the criminal wrong we commit against the next generation by our dead silence on what most concerns their well-being, is but the first step in the path of progress upon which the world has now entered. Already vast strides have been made towards a complete reconstruction of our educational system along these lines. Daily the literature is increasing in output to help teachers, parents, ministers, the college youth and the child, into a right attitude of mind. I call attention to the Bibliography as far as I have been able to compile it, and I would urge you to avail yourselves of it in this crusade.

You will rejoice to find that the highest medical authorities now confirm the standpoint of religion on the social evil. They give the lie to the flippant but prevalent claim that has so long cursed the world, viz., "A boy must sow his wild oats." They insist that a clean, continent life is the absolute prerequisite to fulfilling the highest function with which the Creator has endowed us.

You will rejoice to find that the new education has found the natural and simple method of lifting the veil of deception which surrounds the supreme mystery of the origin of our being. By means of biological study the child, from earliest years, is now made to understand how plants, fishes, insects, birds and animals re-produce their kind. The age of sham miracles is gone with its appeal to credulity—followed by painful disillusionment and the sense of having been cheated. The age of real wonder has come in. Truth is indeed stranger than fiction. The facts of Nature are the sublimest vindication of Religion—feeding the sense of awe and deepening every spiritual inspiration, revealing the inviolable moral

law which is written as well in the body as in the mind and the conscience of man.

Let me close with a few practical suggestions:

I. That this Conference participate by every means in its power in the great campaign of education now inaugurated to combat the Social Evil.

II. That its members affiliate with the various movements now actively engaged in this propaganda.

III. To hold periodical meetings of parents to be addressed by some qualified physician or educator on such themes as "A Plain Talk to Parents on what to tell their children and why?" (Dr. Jay F. Schamberg before Parents of Religious School of Congr. *Rodeph Shalom*, Philadelphia, May 15, 1910.) The object of such meetings shall be to make parents realize that only indirectly upon the school, but directly upon them, rests the responsibility to cultivate the intimate confidence of their children and to give them the guidance and help needed especially in the difficult period of Adolescence.

IV. That we labor for the enactment of necessary legislation like the Illinois law against Pandering—for the protection of innocent girls against the vicious. That we further the movement in various States to require a clean bill of health as requisite to securing a marriage license and any other legislation which may from time to time be found helpful in securing the protection of innocence and the suppression of evil.

V. To make full and courageous use of the pulpit, the press and the platform to denounce the evils of a double moral standard for the sexes. To plead for the exaction of a higher and purer standard of manhood, especially by the women who mistakenly and without knowledge of the dangers to themselves, condone laxity in men. To plead for a truer, tenderer chivalry on the part of men towards mothers, sisters, daughters and wives. To sound the signal of alarm for the safety of the home against its insidious and relentless foe "The Social Evil."

APPENDIX A.

Bibliography:—Historical and Religious.

The Bible

Code of Rabbinic Laws:

Maimonides; "Yad" *Issure Biah*.

Jos. Caro: *Shulhan Aruch*, *Eben Ha'ezer*.

Jewish Encyclopedia: Articles; Chastity, Ethics, Woman; Monogamy, Marriage.

Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, Israel Abrahams, Philadelphia, 1896.

Bibliography:—Scientific and Educational.

History of European Morals, Wm. H. Lecky, Vol. II.

Social Diseases and Marriage, Prince A. Morrow, M.D. Lea Bros. & Co., New York and Philadelphia.

The Social Evil with Special Reference to Conditions existing in the City of New York. By a Committee of Fifteen (Drafted by Prof. Alvin S. Johnson.) G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

Training of the Young in Laws of Sex. Rev. the Hon. E. Lyttleton. Longmans Green & Co.

President Roosevelt's Homes Commission Report. U. S. Government.

The American Boy and the Social Evil from a Physician's Standpoint. Robt. N. Willson, M.D. J. C. Winston Co., Philadelphia, 1905.

Adolescence, J. Stanley Hall, Clarke University.

Youth—its Education, Regimen and Hygiene by the same author, \$1.50.

The Light—Official Organ of the National Purity Congress, published monthly. B. S. Steadwell, La Crosse, Wis.

Vigilance Association. \$1.50. B. S. Steadwell, La Crosse, Wis.

The Daughters of the Poor. A plain story of the White Slave Trade. By Geo. K. Turner. McClure's Magazine, Nov. 1909.

Importing Women for Immoral Purposes. Report of the U. S. Immigration Commission presented by Congressman Dillingham, Dec. 10, 1909.

Education in Sexual Physiology and Hygiene. A Physician's Message including the Author's Talks to Public School pupils, issued by the Board of Education of Cincinnati, O. By Dr. Philip Zenner. Robt. Clarke Co., Cincinnati, O. \$1.00.

Hygiene and Morality, by Lavinia L. Dock, published June, 1910, by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. \$1.25.

Moral Value of the Teaching of the Physiology of Hygiene and Sex in the Public Schools. Jno. L. Heffron, M. D., Syracuse, N. Y., in *Journal of Religious Education*, Feb. 1910.

"Vigilance"—a monthly publication issued by the National Purity Alliance—152 5th Ave., New York.

Transactions of the American Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis. 9 East 42nd St., New York.

Pamphlets issued by same:

Results of the Work Accomplished, by Prince A. Morrow, M. D.

Report of the Work of the Maryland Society, Daniel R. Hooker, M. D.

Report of the Work of the Pennsylvania Society, Robt. N. Willson, M. D.

Report of the Work of the Syracuse Society.

Symposium:—Should a Medical Certificate of Freedom from Transmissible Disease be Required as a Condition of License to Marry? Treated from the Legal, Medical and Sociological Aspects.

Educational Pamphlets:

- I. The Young Man's Problem. 18th thousand. 10 cents.
 - II. For Teachers—Instruction in the Physiology and Hygiene of Sex. 10 cents.
 - III. The Relations of Social Diseases with Marriage and their Prophylaxis (First and Concluding chapters of "Social Diseases and Marriage"). Prince A. Morrow, M.D. Lea Bros. & Co., New York, Publishers.
 - IV. The Boy Problem. 12th thousand. 10 cents.
 - V. How My Uncle, the Doctor, Instructed Me in Matters of Sex. 10 cents.
 - VI. For College Students—Health and Hygiene of Sex. 10 cents.
- How We Are Born—A Letter to Parents for their Children. From the Russian of Mrs. N. J. American Edition, paper, 30 cents. B. S. Steadwell, La Crosse, Wis.

Proceedings of the California Association for the Study and Prevention of Syphilis and Gonorrhea. Mrs. Frances M. Greene, M.D., Pres't., San Jose, Cal.

Bibliography:—Literary.

Freudlings Erwachen by Frank Wedekind; a drama. German 26 editions.

The Awakening of Spring by Frank Wedekind; English with Introduction by Francis J. Ziegler. Brown Bros., Philadelphia, 1909.

Mrs. Warren's Profession. Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant by Bernard Shaw, Brentano, New York.

The Song of Life by Margaret Mosley. McClurg, Chicago, 1902. \$1.25.

APPENDIX B.

Model Law of the State of Illinois against Pandering. Detention of Females.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois represented in the General Assembly: That an Act entitled, "An Act in relation

War on the White Slave Trade, by Ernest A. Bell, Sec'y., Illinois to pandering: To define and prohibit the same, to provide for the punishment thereof, for the competency of certain evidence at the trial therefor, and providing what shall be a defense, "approved June 1, 1908, in force July 1, 1908, including the title of said Act, be amended so as to read as follows:

(1) 2. Any person who shall procure a female inmate for a house of prostitution or who, by promises, threats, violence or by any device or scheme, shall cause, induce, persuade or encourage a female person to become an inmate of a house of prostitution, or shall procure a place as inmate in a house of prostitution for a female person, or any person who shall, by promises, threats, violence or by any device or scheme, cause, induce, persuade or encourage an inmate of a house of prostitution to remain therein as such inmate, or any person who shall by fraud, or artifice, or by duress of person or goods, or by abuse of any position of confidence or authority, procure any female person to become an inmate of a house of ill fame, or to enter any place in which prostitution is encouraged or allowed within this State, or to come into this State or leave this State for the purpose of prostitution, or who shall procure any female person who has not previously practiced prostitution to become an inmate of a house of ill fame within this State, or to come into this State or leave this State for the purpose of prostitution, or who shall receive or give, or agree to receive or give, any money or thing of value for procuring or attempting to procure any female person to become an inmate of a house of ill fame within this State, or to come into this State or leave this State for the purpose of prostitution, shall be guilty of pandering, and upon a first conviction for an offense under this Act shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail or house of correction for a period of not less than six months nor more than one year and by a fine of not less than three hundred dollars and not to exceed one thousand dollars, and upon conviction for any subsequent offense under this Act shall be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary for a period of not less than one year nor more than ten years.

2. It shall not be a defense to a prosecution for any of the Acts prohibited in the foregoing section that any part of such Act or Acts shall have been committed outside this State, and the offense shall in such case be deemed and alleged to have been committed and the offender tried and punished in any county in which the prostitution was intended to be practiced, or in which the offense was consummated, or any overt acts in furtherance of the offense shall have been committed.

3. Any such female person referred to in the foregoing section shall be a competent witness in any prosecution under this Act to testify for or against the accused as to any transaction or as to any conversation with the accused or by him with another person or persons in her presence, not-

withstanding her having married the accused before or after the violation of any of the provisions of this Act, whether called as a witness during the existence of the marriage or after its dissolution.

4. The act or state of marriage shall not be a defense to any violation of this Act.

II

CONFERENCE SERMON PREACHED AT CHARLEVOIX,
MICH., JULY 1, 1910.

BY W. H. FINESHRIBER, Davenport, Iowa.

"And Samuel said unto the people, Fear not: ye have indeed done all this evil; yet turn not aside from following the Lord, but serve the Lord with all your heart; and turn ye not aside; for then should ye go after vain things which can not profit nor deliver, for they are vain."—I. Sam. 12:xx, xxi.

Our fathers selected this episode from the book of Samuel to complement the story of Korah's rebellion. Both sections treat of Israel's rebellion against God. The story in Samuel requires no labored interpretation. Israel deliberately contravened the wish of the Almighty. The lure of an earthly kingdom was too compelling for them. The human love of pomp, the passion to imitate other nations, the splendid circumstance of court life and soldiery prevailed against the simple, direct discipline of the theocracy. But fundamentally, the revolt was an expression of that sempiternal element in our soul life, spiritual inertia, which to destroy has been the aspiration of all religious endeavor. The yoke of the Lord, the Kingship of God, the reign of the ideal, was too hard. Rather bear the incubus of human royalty, endure the mockery of blind leadership, suffer the corroding influences of seeing daily justice scorned and evil crowned, than manfully rise to the task of making supreme, in thought and life, the dominance of God.

Superficially, the uprising of Korah and his conspirators was against Moses and Aaron; but the Midrash rightly suggests that the insurrection, in reality was an affront through Moses to God. For Korah knew that God had appointed Moses as leader. He knew also that it was God's plan to appoint a priesthood, a body of

men, separated from the people, and hallowed to service. Yet he calmly demanded the abolition of priesthood and leadership: "seeing all the congregation are holy . . . wherefore lift ye up yourselves above the assembly of the Lord?" He voices a kind of philosophic anarchy in religion. No need of priests or leaders since all the congregation are holy. It has a certain charm and plausibility, even for us, the premise of a holy congregation, connoting an almost perfect democracy and involving the comforting assurance for each member that he has achieved so high a degree of ethical completeness that spiritual perplexity and human greed, the obverse sides of leadership and priesthood, are no longer horrid intruding realities, but merely the tombs of a departed barbarism.

No wonder that two hundred and fifty eminent men participated in the outbreak. The marvel is that the cleverness of this demagoguery did not succeed in rousing the whole people. Perhaps it did, and perhaps we have here only the carefully edited fragments of a story that would rival in intensity and scope the lurid drama of a French Revolution.

But we shall not approach this with the trappings of higher criticism. Nor are we interested now in the historicity of this cataclysmal scene. Sufficient if we note that the judgment of God on Korah's rebellion was annihilation, and that the fruitage of Israel's revolt against God in the days of Samuel was a bitter but salutary experience.

* * * * *

Recurrent in Jewish history is the theme of Israel's rebellion against God. Almost it seems as if it were the whole burden of prophetic discourse. "A perverse and rebellious generation," a "stiff-necked people," was the verdict of our leaders. Yet not more sinful than other people in like condition and on equal cultural levels, a comparative study of religion tells us. This persistent indictment rather gives us hope. It is the index of growth. Other nations may have paralleled our catalogue of religious and social crimes, but few, indeed if any, have had as sensitive a conscience, and have registered as inevitably, through prophet and leader, every deviation from the path of the divine will. Rebellion and re-

pentance, systole and diastole, mark not only the perfect functioning of the religious organism, but imply further the favor of God, evidenced in the sense of well-being that springs from every successful effort in the religious cycle.

The two types of rebellion, however, of which we shall treat, tonight, are by far the most serious of all. They are systemic, not local, threatening, if unchecked, the very life of Israel as a religious people. For the attack, in these instances, is not upon isolated moral precepts, but upon the whole code of right living. It has no concern with the ethic of the individual, but by evasion and denial challenges directly the plan of God. That plan, for you and me, requires no elaborate justification. It has been revealed in our history and validated by our experience. It is the priesthood of Israel to God and for the world. Essentially to flout this was the heresy of Korah, and against the yoke of it did Israel rebel in the days of Samuel.

It is not otherwise to-day. Save only that these principles are operative on a larger scale. Consider the rebellion exemplified in the Samuel story. Wearied of God's leadership, they demanded a human king. It is a type easily recognized. It reveals a universal human failing. The fathers hitched their wagon to a star, traversing field and forest, stream and mountain, with eye steadfast on the goal. They are the path-breakers. The children are appalled at the distance, the immensity of the undertaking, and fain would postpone indefinitely the completion of the journey. They begin to see clearly every obstacle and there is much talk of conditions and barriers, of road building and wayside inns. Not that they have yielded up the hope of ultimate achievement, but in all sincerity have gained too much practical wisdom. "It is not incumbent upon us to finish the work," they cry, "in the meantime let us do as the other nations and select a king. Then our responsibility will be divided."

Clear cut and illuminating would it be, if I could single out one group in Israel to whom this characterization would apply. But in varying degree it is the possession of all. Progressive and conservative, Nationalist and Radical, have been guilty of this rebellion.

And it has taken forms protean. Each group has chosen a king who is to solve the problem of the destiny of Israel. I have no quarrel with the character of these kings. They are all of them, without exception, the expression of sincere, nay, passionate desires to heal the hurt of Israel. My fear is like that of Samuel, that in following the king, they may turn aside from following the Lord.

There are some in our day who feel that the indifference prevailing in American Judaism is primarily due to a lack of adequate and inspiring mode of religious expression. They have confidence in the innate religiousness of the Jew, but they are convinced that our rather formal service, in which the congregation is auditor rather than worshiper, will in time dry up the wells of inspiration. They understand well the infinite complexity of the religious life, its sources and affiliations. It is composed of dreams and realities, utters itself in poetry and prose. It is rooted in the whole nature of man and demands an equally catholic speech. Music and symbol, the appeal to dim memories, the evocation, by storied ritual, of emotion grounded in the sufferings of the race, the sense of continuity, often of identity, with our forefathers, achieved through prayer and aspiration in a tongue not ours but theirs—all this is truly religious. It is valid religious expression and richly beautiful. Yet it is sometimes only a segment, frequently but a tangent of the circle of religious experience. The center of religion lies, after all, in faith and work, and the twain are one, not only as differing aspects of one reality, but chemically one. Without sustaining faith in the ultimate good that comes from religious work, without that inspiriting, genuinely Jewish doctrine of partnership with God, in the process of helping humanity to realize itself, all work, however nobly planned and honestly tried, must fail. Conversely, faith, luxuriating simply in emotion, made vocal largely through the convenient organ of cult and ceremony, exercising itself in tortured introspection and selfish fear, but barren of creative work for self and others, devoid of propulsive force and influence—such faith is ephemeral, an air bubble in the rushing stream of life. It is such a faith as this that over-emphasis of the external, merely vocal elements in religion would stimulate. And most pathetic folly of all

would be to indulge that crude but tender fetichism which would have us believe in the magic possibilities of phrases, however stumbingly pronounced, that were once alive with meaning on the lips of our fathers. Each changing generation, if it be true to itself, must create or shape its own book of prayer. If Reform, on its external side, has meant anything it has meant just this: the imperative need of constant re-valuation and reconstruction of our service and ritual. Elimination is as important as nutrition, and if our religious life demands a more varied, a richer expression through form and symbol, as I believe it does, it will not come through resurrection but through birth, not through conservation but through dynamic religious activity. Back of it all is the rebellion of which our fathers and we have been guilty. Some have chosen Ritual as King.

Others have paraphrased the indifference of our day as ignorance. The pressure of the day has left no opportunity for the modern Jew to drink of the deep well of Jewish knowledge. He is ignorant of our scientific triumphs. He does not know the brilliant achievements of our philosophers and sages. He is unaware that we have had an almost unexampled list of saints and warriors, of dreamers and poets; that we have influenced appreciably, sometimes mightily, every onward movement, in science and economics, for the emancipation of man and society. We have obviously deduced that the corrective therefor was an intenser and wider knowledge of Jewish literature. So we have set to work with great enthusiasm, and our educational organizations, Chautauquas and Councils, lodges and lecture platforms have accomplished splendid results. But this wide diffusion of knowledge has had one curious consequence. In some circles, Wissenschaft has become a cult, almost a substitute for religion. The preacher is never wearied of pouring out streams of encyclopedian information, and the audience is always tremendously thrilled at the recital of its ancestors' mental and spiritual conquests. The sermon instead of being a direct stimulus to action is most often food for racial pride. But whatever its theme, it must be scholarly. Rabbi and scholar must be synonymous. A curious transvaluation of the function of preaching. Intelligible

enough in the light of history, because for centuries the Rabbi was the creator and conservator of Jewish knowledge. But we shall soon be forced to see that scholarship is safer in the hands of the professional scholar. And I say this with all honor to the remarkable men who have the genius for scholarship and yet can wondrously move men by preaching. For the most of us, an honest shifting of the emphasis is necessary. Is it so little a thing to mould human lives that we would barter it even for the high privilege of adding a mite to the aggregate of knowledge? Is the example of the prophets lost upon us? It is not new ideas or striking theories that our people need, but passionately earnest, simple preaching to galvanize them into action. Let us not be afraid of commonplaces. Let us chastise the pride of intellect, and open our hearts to vigorous religious emotions. Not even knowledge dare be our king.

A favorite phrase with earnest students of Jewish problems has been "a distinctive Jewish consciousness." By it they mean the whole psychic complex which the Jew has inherited and achieved in thousands of years. It manifests itself in countless ways. In faith and morals, in art and philosophy, Jewish personality leaves its peculiar impress. It is contended that this Jewish individuality, the quintessence of Jewish genius, must at all hazards be conserved, else the Jew and Judaism die. To accomplish this all the methods herein before discussed must be employed. The slogan is Judaization of the Jew, the intensive cultivation of the soil of our traditional inheritance, the systematic rejection of all that is alien. It is a sort of mental and spiritual inbreeding, and will issue, if it ever be tried seriously, in absolute sterility. Besides, it suffers from the vice of all these Kings in Israel—externality. By outward means it seeks to perpetuate an outward sign, a trade-mark. It misses the mark, this cry for the Jewish consciousness as a means to keep us distinct from competing religions or peoples. It mistakes, like all the rest, shadow for substance.

Who, then, you ask, shall be King in Israel? With Samuel, I answer, "Turn not aside from following the Lord." He alone is Israel's King. Korah's rebellion and fate shadow forth the destiny

of Israel, unless we rouse our dormant wills and follow the Lord and obey His commandment. As I view Israel's history through all its glories and vicissitudes, I see but one law struggling for realization, the duty of priesthood. Korah's sin lay in denying the need of this sacramental call. Therefore he ceased to be. There are not many modern Korahs who have renounced as boldly Israel's mission to the world. If there are they have long been cut off from the community of Israel. But just as there are atheists whose lips mechanically pronounce the name of God, so there are Jews who perfunctorily prate of our mission. Their faith in its possibility is moribund. Desperately they concoct excuses and the need for a King in Israel is the most common subterfuge. If, then, as Samuel realized and experience teaches, we must have Kings, let them not be substitutes for, but expression of our priesthood.

Let us reverently and honestly reform our Ritual; let us increase our knowledge and intimate understanding of our traditional literature; let us deepen our sense of distinctiveness, but let also ever keep in mind that these are subsidiary and external. The heart of the matter is work not words. Of missionary announcements we have had enough. It has been preached, if not adequately, then at least so that if Israel were to disappear, its literary remains would show the world what we had intended to do. What is needful now is actual work, vitalization of the plan, a ministry to the world's spiritual wants by personal life and influence. If saints are needed to correct the world's materialistic myopia, it shall be ours to produce them. If heroes are called for in the stress of political and economic warfare, let us send them to the front. If the broken and contrite heart is a perfect sacrifice unto the Lord, let us be servants of God in the prophetic sense, that the world's arrogance be humbled. Above all, let us concentrate our attention upon our missionary work, not everlastingly on ourselves. There will be no Jewish problem if there is a real Jewish mission. The fear of disintegration and loss of Jewish distinctiveness seems to me at times both blasphemous and puerile. It is symptomatic of lack of faith in the divine plan, of obstinacy in refusing to see the evidence in our miraculous preservation, of childishness in mistaking the name for

the thing. We shall not do our world-work by striving for a distinctively Jewish consciousness, but we shall become distinctively Jewish by doing our work for the world. We can profit much by studying sympathetically the missionary enterprises of our daughter faith. Whatever views we may hold about her psychology of conversion, however we may cavil at the methods of her missionaries, only the wilfully blind will refuse to see that all this evangelical activity springs from a consuming zeal to give to others the spiritual joys which the devotees experience. Especially, and here is the relevant idea, does this proselyting passion react on and enrich their own religious life.

Our purpose is not to convert the heathen or gain a pyrrhic victory by flaunting a Jewish banner over the Christian world. We are a priest people and we are not concerned with names. If the phrase means anything, it means service, not mastery. So our fathers interpreted it. So the pioneers of Reform, with instinctive truth, translated it, and made it the corner-stone of our whole structure. If our young men have grown weary and faint, it is not because they are consciously recreant to the cause, but because the priestly impulse latent within them has found no inspiring plan for actualization. It has been inhibited because they are suspicious of and satiated with mere phrases. Because their real need has not been met, the worst of them have turned to the gods of the heathen, wallowing before them in sensuality and vice, the great majority worship the Baal of conformity and indifference, and the few, sincere but misguided, put their trust in the earthly kings of Ritual and Knowledge and the Jewish consciousness. For these last there is hope. Like unto Samuel, we shall let them choose their kings and follow, if only they turn not aside from following the Lord. But unless they serve the Lord with all their heart, insensibly their rebellion will shade into the revolt of Korah, the fruit of which is death.

On our shoulders, as leaders in Israel, rests this tremendous responsibility. I have faith that we shall compass our aim. I believe that the great constructive, practical work already accomplished since the days of Mendelssohn is a token of what the Jew can do in

the future. He needs no further preparation. Moses and the prophets, the scribes and the Rabbis have planted the seed. The inquisition and the ghettos, pogroms and prejudices have watered and nourished this wondrous plant. Even a detached twig, like Aaron's rod, can bloom and blossom. Storms have not uprooted it nor has lightning prevailed against it. We need not therefore be dismayed. As long as God finds use for it, to shelter and feed and serve humanity, it will live. We have in our generation men of wisdom, skilled in practical affairs. We have leaders of men, learned in the mysteries of the human heart. Let us so fill them with enthusiasm that they will co-operate in the privilege of transmuting words into deed and life, the missionary ideal into active service.

I

LIFE AND LAW

CONFERENCE LECTURE, BY RABBI ISAAC L. RYPINS, St. Paul, Minn.

Deeply do I appreciate the privilege accorded to me to address this Conference. Yet, this privilege is not unattended with difficulties. Nor do I assume the honor without diffidence. I am conscious of the fact that I am addressing men trained and tried in the science and art of public speaking. This fact, however, is but a trifling embarrassment compared to the real responsibility put upon a conference orator. Of him is rightly expected a message that shall prove of immediate interest and of permanent value. He is to sound a note that shall vibrate in the minds of his hearers, and he is to enunciate a truth that shall strike a responsive chord in their souls. However, having accepted the honor and having assumed the responsibility, it becomes my pleasure and duty to present to you a problem of religious difficulty and moral perplexity which demands of us reasonable consideration and rational solution.

"What is the matter with Judaism?" is an oft repeated present day cry. This plaintive query applies not only to reform, but to every other phase of Judaism as well. Moreover, this cry, though raised by laymen, of necessity evokes an echo in the heart of the Rabbinate. Religious indifference confronts us on all sides, and notwithstanding oft repeated public protestations to the contrary, the synagogue is not the most sought for institution of to-day.

But before entering into a consideration of the causes of irreligion with us, we may ask the broader question: "What is the matter with religion to-day?" The religious indifference we have good reason to complain of, obtains too in the ranks of other creeds. The entire body social seems infested with the virus of irreligion.

While it may be contended with reasonable plausibility that church building and church activity are visibly extensive, it must

also be admitted that the people in their lives are little touched by the spiritual influences of religion. Gross materialism abounds everywhere. Wordly interests and wordly pleasures are, after all, the motives of men's conduct and activity. The search for happiness finds expression in the quest for physical pleasure. The desire for gain, regardless of methods used in its acquirement, is indicative of the lack of spiritual influence in the lives of the people.

True, charity is practiced and substance is spent in the effort to ameliorate the condition of the destitute. Philanthropic activities are growing in number and magnitude. Humanity, it may be held, is steadily ascending the scale of culture and civilization. To-day peace conferences are held; and universal peace among the nations seems soon to become a realized blessing.

Yet notwithstanding all this, there is at the very core of modern life a lack of the vital and energizing force of the life spiritual. Men and women are actuated in their conduct by motives utilitarian. The safety and peace of the community are sought as means for the readier attainment of wordly ends. Conduct inspired by motives of pure religion is not a part of the everyday life of the average individual. **יראת יהוה** The fear of God, true reverence, is not a basic principle of individual conduct. Virtue, to be lived and practiced, is not esteemed essential to character. That men and women be but fairly decent in their relations is all that is asked. The standard of individual and personal morality has been lowered in the estimate of life's values and purposes. Therefore the manifest present day irreligiousness.

It is contended that the spirit of the age is responsible for all this. During the last century science has revolutionized human knowledge. Through the benign influences of scientific discovery the field of intellectual vision has been broadened. Her insistent demonstrations in every domain of research has made science the reigning mistress of the world. Reverently do we worship at her sacred shrines. To her dicta we yield implicit faith and ready assent.

But frequently even science transcends the legitimate limits of demonstrated knowledge. Science has indeed been the pathfinder and interpreter of nature's hidden truths. But she is not content with the investigation of the underlying laws of visible phenomena.

She permits herself to speculate concerning duty and destiny. Science reduces man to the atom and the molecule; resolves mind to matter, and eliminates the soul from the equation of life. Thus materialistic science attempts to solve man—"The Riddle of the Universe"—from the standpoint of matter only. Even in the investigation of mind and soul science seeks a physical basis.

With due deference to science for the great good achieved by her manifest truths, we justly feel the right to protest against her assumed speculations. This right of protest we feel because science assumes that morality is not inherent in man, but is a conventional institution objectively superimposed upon him. In the process of evolution, man somehow acquired notions of conduct which by the aid of sagacious leaders, crystallized into systems of religion. Building upon this thesis, science attempts to explain all phenomena of religious evolution from a purely materialistic beginning.

We should, however, have little quarrel with science even on the score of her attempted speculation on life, duty and destiny. But science, because of her manifest physical truths, has laid strong hold upon men's minds by her metaphysical speculations and has carried them off their mental balance. Because of the convictions materialistic science has inspired, she has swept before her every stronghold of faith and has stormed the very fortress of religion. She has even impelled many to give assent to her theoretic speculations, and to accept these as scientific truths. Thus men argue that if religion is not inherent in life, but is a superimposed convention, what binding authority can religion hold over them? Why esteem virtue a divine command? It may indeed be desirable to have moral standards, but what assurance have we that these are truths absolute, universally binding?

Such conclusions, drawn from premises, seemingly scientific, have dethroned religion and stripped her of authoritative sanction. And we Jews, whose pride of thought is rationalism, have not been slow to take advantage of this seemingly scientific doctrine. We even apply our conclusions openly. Not only do we care little for religion, but we boast of our indifference thereto. We delight to be in the very van of all that is scientifically new.

But materialistic science utterly fails to give rational account of man's destiny and duty. She fails from sheer mental blindness.

Science recognizes life elements, as underlying and governing principles, in the mineral and vegetable worlds. She speaks of electro-magnetic and vito-chemical elements. But science refuses to recognize a distinct life element, as the underlying and controlling principle of man. She reduces man to the atom and builds him up again into man. But man as well as the mineral has an underlying life element. This basic life element is the soul.

True, the soul can neither be chemically tested, nor physically measured. The soul may not be perceived with the naked eye. But, can chemical affinity be physically perceived? Can magnetism be materially discerned? The materialistic scientist contends that these elements are ultimates, and therefore in essence unknowable. They may be recognized, however, in their activities and may be known by their effects. So man's basic life-element—his soul—though physically not to be measured, nor chemically to be tested, nor materially to be seen, as an ultimate in nature, makes itself felt by its distinct and inherent manifestations.

The failure of science to recognize this fundamental truth, deprives her of the ability to give a rational account of man, as a moral and spiritual being. Yet so long as science holds sway over the minds of men; and they continue to consider even her speculative dicta as demonstrated truth, religion will continue to suffer in maintaining itself as a vital factor in life.

To meet the present day irreligious situation, the teacher of religion need not decry science. He should openly recognize the gratitude we owe to demonstrated knowledge. But he should discriminate clearly between established scientific truth and assumed scientific speculation. He also should establish himself firmly on solid ground, and should likewise insist that morality is a scientific truth; and that religion is a demonstrable fact.

This at first may seem an impossible task. We have been taught to believe religion revealed and not demonstrated truth: and we have been contending throughout historic time, because each religion insists that its own revelation is the true and historic revelation. This universal contention for priority and superiority has also had

the effect of weakening religion in the esteem of many. Therefore to establish religion on a scientific basis, we must first define the terms used. Words mean only what we understand them to mean.

One of the most essential terms used in treating the subject religion, is morality. This term, however, has been variously defined; and is being variously used. But to avoid ambiguity and to deal with morality from the standpoint of science, the term must be given exact and definite meaning; and must be strictly limited to that specific meaning. Therefore, let me present to you what I consider a rational and scientific definition of the word.

"Morality is man's established harmonic relation to the Constructive Principle of his own being."

To state this truth clearly: There is a constructive principle in nature. It is one of Nature's fundamental Laws. It is the Principle which upbuilds inorganic matter; organizes vegetable and animal matter into living, organic bodies; renews and sustains individual life; and is the essential element in all development, physical and spiritual. This principle is fixed and immutable. If man would grow, evolve and unfold physically and spiritually, he must live in harmony with that Principle. He must maintain the harmonics of the relation.

Morals, refer to definite and specific principles and rules of individual conduct. By conscious and intelligent practice of morals, man may conform his life to the constructive principle of his being. By maintaining the harmony of that relation, he may solve the complex problems of his obligations to man and nature.

The practice of moral principles, therefore, is the *living of a life* in strict conformity with those Principles and Rules of conduct whereby man satisfies the requirements of the constructive principle of nature and maintains that established harmonic relation in his own soul.

This analysis will suggest that there is an exact and scientific basis for religion within the power of demonstration. When this fact is understood, and its importance appreciated, the seeming gulf between religion and science is bridged. They become one in the minds of both religionist and scientist, as they are indeed in essence. There can be no antagonism in their essential nature. Whatever antagon-

ism there has been exists only in the minds of those who do not understand the true meaning and function of religion and science; nor the essential relation they sustain to each other and to nature.

"Science is exact knowledge of the facts of nature, classified and systematized."

"Truth is the established relation the facts of science sustain to each other and to the Individual Intelligence, or Soul of man."

"Philosophy is the conclusions which men, in their search for a knowledge of the truth, draw from the facts of science."

"Religion is the application of the facts of science and the conclusions of philosophy to individual life and conduct."

It may be noted, that science has reference alone to the phenomena of nature. Truth has reference to the relation which the phenomena of nature sustain to each other and to the Individual Intelligence.

Philosophy has reference to the deductions which men have drawn from the phenomena of nature in their search for truth. And religion is the application of such knowledge as we possess to the problems of individual life and conduct. Hence, science and philosophy and religion are in no sense conflicting. They do not antagonize each other in their essential nature. They are, indeed concomitant factors in the same great problem of individual life and unfoldment. And *Truth* is the vital element relating them all.

Now the clear principle of relationship between religion and science may be perceived and understood. Thus natural science and true religion are one and the same; and a true understanding of this great truth, makes science a religion and lifts religion to the basis of science.

Thus religion becomes again rehabilitated into its right rank. It is no longer a mere abstraction to be classed among the speculative sciences. But it is *a life to be lived* according to definite principles.

This truth applies especially to Judaism. תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקוב The ethical code and the moral principles Moses commanded us is *our* holy heritage.

The recent controversy on "Reform is a failure" and the slogan raised "Back to Orthodoxy," are but passing currents in the sea of

time. These outbursts of vehement religious discontent may cause other standards of religious profession to be raised; and other ensigns of congregational affiliation to be unfurled.

They may even manifest new marks of Jewish Individualism. **איש על דגלו** Every man by his own standard. But will they effect or influence the lives of our people? The anxiety of these leaders seems to be to preserve and to perpetuate fossilized Jewish institutions, rather than to resuscitate and revivify Jewish life.

Our insistence should be: Back to the "Torah," back to the fundamental truths of our religious genius, Moses. Teach the people the Law that they may live the life. **הבינני ואחיה** is the passionate cry of the psalmist. "Teach me to know and I shall live the life."

To many of our Rabbis the pressing need of our times seems the saving of established systems. In this attempt they behold the salvation of Judaism and the moral and spiritual regeneration of the Jew. Some would preserve Orthodoxy, entire, or in part; others would make a fetish of reform and worship it. What seems more urgent, however, is the saving of the moral life of the unnumbered unaffiliated who are neither orthodox nor reformed. Our mission, I feel, is not to perpetuate systems of belief, whether orthodox or reform, but to live ethically true, and morally Jewish lives. This simple, yet all encompassing truth, we may learn from the Deuteronomist who sums up the whole function of the moral law thus: "I set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose thou life that thou mayest live, both thou and thy seed; to love the Lord thy God and to cleave unto him."

As men our duty is to live in complete accord with the moral principles of our Torah. As Rabbis it is our sacred mission to teach the people the moral Law that they may learn to live the moral life, **כי הוה חייד וארך ימיו** "For God and His truth are thy life and the strength of thy days."

J

RELIGIOUS SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

BY RABBI ISAAC LANDMAN, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

We ought to refer to the schools, connected with our congregations, as "Religious Schools." They are not Sabbath Schools, because the majority of them hold sessions on Sunday only. They are not Sunday School, because the connotation of this term is foreign to our conception of such a school. They are Religious Schools, because the principal subject taught is religion; the history studied, in the main, deals with the religious significance of historical events and characters; the Hebrew instruction has its value in the fact that the language is used in our religious services. Our schools, therefore, are, in every sense of the term, Religious Schools.

The education in our Religious Schools aims at training men and women, possessing a moral nature, to adhere to the cause for which these schools stand. In considering their organization, therefore, we must hold in view an ideal curriculum, ideal methods of instruction, ideal teachers to convey this instruction, ideal time in which this instruction is to be given, and ideal physical conditions under which the school sessions should be held.

If the definition of a Religious School, here given, is correct, then the Religious School must be a matter of first importance, both to the rabbi and the congregation. The Synagogue is established for worship, for teaching Judaism, for strengthening its adherents in their faith and developing their moral fibre. The Religious School, designed to render this service to the children and youth of the congregation, and to raise them with an intelligent knowledge of their history and religion, must, therefore, be looked upon, not as an adjunct to the pulpit and the other congregational activities, but as the principal activity of the Congregation and its Rabbi.

The course of study and the method of instruction should, therefore, be so organized as to imbue the pupils with such a spirit and understanding of Judaism that, from childhood up, they will be prepared to make sacrifices for the Faith and, in manhood and womanhood, live in accordance with its religious and ethical precepts. The teachers must be men and women who are not only trained in pedagogic method, but who, themselves, have a thorough knowledge and a sympathetic understanding of the history and development of Judaism and of its application to modern life and conditions. The time for instruction should be on days and in hours when the children are not worn out mentally and physically from other labors, and the physical conditions such as will attract the children and encourage the parents to insist upon attendance.

Now, we may differ on what constitute ideal curriculum and ideal methods of instruction. The subjective element that enters into teaching, the temperament and personality of the teacher, can only be commented upon; hard and fast rules can not be laid down in this matter, though experience and study may guide us. In certain other matters of organization, however, such as physical condition, equipment, grading, classes, hours of instruction, etc., we may arrive at definite conclusions.

In discussing both the practical and theoretic problems of Religious School Organization and in offering concrete illustrations, I shall, from time to time, make reference to the Religious School of Temple Keneseth Israel, of Philadelphia. I hope you will pardon this, because here is a school whose organization and instruction, though by no means ideal, have been praised by many who have examined its methods; and besides, it is the one school with which I am thoroughly acquainted. I know its strengths and its weaknesses, its successful experiments and its failures. I know, also, the difficulties with which Dr. Krauskopf has been battling for more than a score of years and the ideals which he has set before him. During the past four years I had the honor to assist him, actively, in the instruction, organization, and direction of the institution; to see some of these ideals realized and to plan the ultimate realization of others. The following suggestions have

in mind what I consider to be an ideal Religious School Organization.

PHYSICAL CONDITION: Under the best conditions, we receive our children on mornings when their schoolmates are at play, or in the afternoons when they are worn out from their secular studies. This handicap can be somewhat overcome by having our Religious School rooms brighter, cheerier, better ventilated, more pleasant and attractive than are even the most modern public and private school buildings.

Religious School rooms in the cellars of our Temples ought to be tabooed. It is a great deal to ask parents, in this age of hygienic insistence, to send their children, after a day's confinement in the class-room, to our dingy synagogue basements. This drawback to enthusiastic interest in the physical condition of our schools can be overcome only by separate school buildings. The ideal Religious School organization, therefore, begins with a separate school building, well lighted, heated and ventilated.

EQUIPMENT: The school-room should be equipped with modern, comfortable seats of the type and standard the children are used to in their secular schools. We know of some schools where the desks are of the vintage of '49 and wonder why the pupils are restless and uncomfortable. The walls should be bright and clean. They should be decorated with mural paintings, maps and pictures, pertinent to the subject taught in each particular room. These should be not only adornments that will prove attractive to the children, but actual aids in the instruction.

GRADING: The Religious Schools should be divided into three departments: Kindergarten, Intermediary and Confirmation departments, and into eleven grades. The question of the Confirmation age has come up before the Conference several times. The ideal period for Confirmation, as we have found it after practical experience in the Religious School of Keneseth Israel, is sixteen. Accepting this age for the moment, the school should be graded as follows: Kindergarten Department, six to eight years, two classes; Intermediary Department, nine to fourteen years, six

classes; Confirmation Department, fifteen to seventeen years, three classes, including the Post-Confirmation class in the last year.

CLASSES: Not more than twenty-five pupils should constitute any single class. Knowing full well that the teachers we employ accept their positions as "extra work," and that the pupils labor under disadvantages not found in the secular school, the ideal class should have but twenty pupils or less. In the earlier years of the Religious School the subjects taught, especially the religious and ethical lessons derived from the themes handled, are of such a nature that the personal relationship between teacher and pupil must be extraordinarily fostered to make the teaching successful. The smaller the class, therefore, especially in the earlier grades, the more excellent will be the results attained.

CURRICULUM: In the two Kindergarten years the lessons should consist of selected stories, not from the Bible alone, but from all Jewish sources. There are many tales of religious, moral and ethical significance in Jewish history of the Middle Ages and even of modern times that will hold the interest of the little ones. Besides, it will acquaint them early with names, places and events that will impress themselves upon their memories and make the instruction in the older grades much more easy and effective.

In the six classes of the Intermediary Department Jewish history should be taught from the earliest times to the Spanish Expulsion. In this department one of the principal aims should be to encourage Bible reading by the children in the school and, through the children, by the parents at home. For the past four years we have used the Bible as the text book for biblical history and religion in the first five years of the Intermediary Department of our Religious School. The sixth year we devote to general review—Jewish history studied from its religious and ethical standpoint—and to the rudiments of Hebrew.

Regarding the use of the Bible as a text book, I beg to report that, with the exception of the first year, when Dr. Krauskopf and I began to outline the course, we have had no difficulty with certain passages which some Religious School pedagogues would eliminate from the Bible that is placed in the children's hands.

The Bible is not read right through; only selected passages are assigned for class and home reading. We have found that the pupils like to read the Bible; that the majority of parents are interested enough to read the assigned chapters or verses with them; that the religious, moral, or ethical lesson to be derived from the story in hand reaches home, especially when it is supplemented with a story of similar import from the Talmud, the Midrash, Jewish history, or general history.

The first two years in the Confirmation Department should complete the study of Jewish history and the progress and development of Judaism from the earliest to modern times. The course should not only prepare the pupils for the Confirmation Ceremony, but must imbue them with the religious and moral strength to meet the stern realities of life; and bind them rationally to the Synagogue. Sufficient Hebrew should be taught for the children to follow the Hebrew passages in the prayer book intelligently.

THE AGE OF CONFIRMATION: Confirmation should be the climax of the years of religious instruction and training that precede the ceremony. The ceremony itself need not be insisted upon; the instruction and influence of the knowledge gained therefrom, in the lives of the children, is the most important factor in the Confirmation course. Participation in the ceremony, therefore, ought to be not a matter of age limit, but of actual knowledge of Judaism, its history, its meaning and its obligations, which the Confirmant is about to assume. If the preparation for Confirmation aims also to train and strengthen the religious and moral nature of the candidate for the ceremony, and to supply him or her with religious and moral weapons to meet the exigencies of a skeptical and materialistic era, sixteen should be the minimum age of Confirmation.

The Confirmation instruction, if it can not form in the boy and girl absolute conviction, ought, at least, to lay the foundation for the religious and moral attitude of the man and woman. Such problems as: The Existence of God, the Development of the God Idea in the Bible, Immortality, the Mission of Judaism, the Meaning of Reform Judaism, Our Attitude toward Other Creeds, the

Divine Mission of Life, the Mystery of Evil, Suffering, Reward and Punishment, Man, A Social and Religious Being, Culture of Heart, Mind and Soul, etc., can not be discussed with children thirteen or fourteen years old and of grammar school intelligence. Nor can these themes have lasting value in the life of the man and woman when, learned, at this age, by rote or catechistic method and in the form of definitions.

Dr. Deutsch has pointed out that the difficulty in teaching post-Biblical history lies in the age of the pupil, not in the text books or teachers. It is a subject that can be impressed best on children who have had two or three years of general history. So it is with the Confirmation Themes here suggested. Definite and lasting impressions from these can be made only on children of high-school age and intelligence. The method of teaching should be by means of free discussion. The boys and girls should be given the opportunity to contribute to the development of the theme. In doing so they offer the teacher the opportunity to impress and, perhaps, to convince.

In our own Religious School we have gained the best results with pupils who are sixteen and above, juniors and seniors in the high school, when they enter the Confirmation class. I have the great satisfaction to record that these are the young men and women who have become most closely attached to the Temple and its work, who are interested in the congregational adult classes and in communal activities.

THE TIME FOR CONFIRMATION: With all due respect to the report of the Committee on Social and Religious Union, wherein it was recommended that Shebuoth should be the only day for the Confirmation ceremony, I beg to express the opinion that a more unfortunate time for this ceremony than Shebuoth could hardly have been selected. Every rabbi has experienced the remarkable religious spirit that takes hold of the Confirmants, the Religious School, and the Congregation as a whole, when the time for the Confirmation ceremony draws near. When this spirit blossoms into genuine religious enthusiasm and fervor and the ceremony is over, the school is disbanded for the year, parents and

children leave for their summer outings, and we close up shop and take our vacations. For us to remain at our posts and continue the religious services, with preaching, as during the winter months, would avail us nothing, for the bulk of the people and the children are away from the cities, and the congregational activities are at an end for the year.

To retain and conserve this religious spirit and enthusiasm, awakened in the children and reawakened in the parents and in the congregation, we must change the time for Confirmation to a period when the religious and congregational activities begin, in the fall of the year, say, for example, on Sh'mini Atzereth, or Simchath Torah. Instead of permitting all the good work accomplished by the Confirmation studies and ceremony to seep out on the seashore sands and in the lake resorts, and to evaporate on the mountain pleasure places during the hot summer months, the impression created and the enthusiasm aroused will be duly stamped on the whole school and congregation, when, *with* the Confirmation ceremony, the congregational and pulpit activities will not end, but begin. The Post-Confirmation class will continue the work of the Confirmation class from an advanced point of view. Shebouth can be made the time for Religious School closing and the formal graduation of the Post-Confirmation class. Traditionally, there is just as much authority for Sh'mini Atzereth or Simchath Torah for the Confirmation day as there is for Shebuoth. Dr. Krauskopf has actually submitted this suggested change of the Confirmation day, informally, to the Board of Temple Keneseth Israel.

TEACHERS: The teachers should be Normal School graduates and should be men and women with a devout love for the cause of Judaism. They should be trained not only in pedagogic method, but in the religious, ethical and moral work they are to teach.

In communities where volunteer and untrained teachers are the rule, it should be the rabbi's task to prepare the lessons with the teachers every week. When I was rabbi in Montreal and had volunteer teachers, I held weekly lessons with each one of them, teaching them the assigned work and then having them teach

the lesson back to me, as they should do it in the class room. The very fact that I had interested myself in the Religious School to the extent of giving up two afternoons a week to teach the teachers, aroused enthusiasm for the school among the parents of the children and my results were, in turn, quite satisfactory.

PREPARING THE LESSON: We know full well that, even with teachers who are Normal School graduates and who hold public school positions, knowledge of things Jewish is limited and time for collateral reading is not plentiful. The aim of lessons for the Religious School should, therefore, have in mind the teachers, and the difficulties under which they labor, rather than the pupils. The teachers should know how the lessons are to be presented and why certain things should be taught. The rabbi should meet the teachers, at least, once every two weeks, not only for the consideration of conditions in the school and the progress of the classes, but for the purpose of stimulating the teachers in their work.

Appreciating the delicacy of my position in opposing the recommendation of the President, in his message to the Conference, before the Committee on President's Message reports, to wit: that the Conference "apply itself to the task of creating a series of text books for the religious school, beginning, most naturally, with a Bible history," I hope that I will be pardoned for expressing here my sincere conviction that any system of teaching, to be produced by us, should be one of Teachers' Helps, rather than of text books for the children.

In the Kindergarten Department text books are not necessary, as a matter of course. In the Intermediary Department, where biblical history and religion are taught, there is no better text book than the Bible. The Teachers' Helps to be prepared for the instruction in these classes should be so clear, so simple and comprehensive that the dullest volunteer teacher will be able to impart the lesson. Where the teachers are trained and compensated there should be no difficulty; where they are untrained and unpaid the rabbi should follow the system of teaching the teachers, mentioned above. Even in the last year of the Intermediary Department and in the Pre-Confirmation class the story should first

be related, and the lesson presented, orally. A one volume "History of the Jews," written for children, of the type of Dickens' "Child's History of England," would prove of immense assistance in these classes for collateral reading. The more important Confirmation subjects, as indicated above, can not be taught from a text book at all. They should be discussed in the class, eliciting the opinion of the children. Summaries, prepared in advance, taking cognizance, however, of the contributions made by the pupils, should be dictated to them. Essays on the discussions, based on these summaries and written at home, should be brought in for the next lesson, read by the authors, and discussed by the class.

We have found, in Keneseth Israel, that a system on these outlines, with all the drawbacks of which Dr. Krauskopf and I are fully cognizant, has worked exceptionally well. We have prepared twenty-six advance and three review lessons for the teachers of every class. We meet the teachers twice a month and receive written criticisms of these lessons. We are endeavoring, every year, to improve them, in accordance with the difficulties met by the teachers, both in preparation and in the class room.

SCHOOL BOARDS: The fate of the Religious School rests on the rabbi, not upon the school board. The gentlemen of the board, in every community, no matter how successful, can not lay out a curriculum and are too busy to attend school sessions. The physical condition of the school and its financial matters should be left entirely to the board. The school work, itself, should be entirely in the hands of the rabbi.

THE PRINCIPAL: In large cities a university graduate, or a man of broad affairs, or a principal in one of the public schools, may be developed, through personal efforts of the rabbi, to become of great service to him and to the Religious School. He should not, however, be made the principal of the school, volunteer or paid, in the sense that a man is the principal of a secular school. The rabbi should be at the head of the school; he should be in personal touch with all its departments and with the teachers. He should not teach during school sessions, but should superintend the teaching in the class rooms. He should, himself, instruct in

the Confirmation Department, that his personality and religious enthusiasm may impress themselves upon the children.

SESSIONS: The school should convene the second week in September and close the second week in June. The ideal time for holding the sessions is at the same hour when the religious services are held in the synagogue. Where there are separate school buildings, it is a very simple matter. This arrangement will result in bringing even the littlest children to the school and their parents to the services. Parents who now *send* their children to the school will bring them, attend services and meet the children to take them home about the time when the service in the synagogue is concluded. Parents and pupils will thus be taught to attend both the services and the Religious School, and to come on time. Two-hour sessions, half an hour for children's service and an hour and a half for instruction, is possible in every community.

In communities where the school rooms are in the temple basement, or in the temple proper, the sessions should be held on Sunday mornings and where there are Sunday services, on Sunday afternoon. Children are more prompt in attending afternoon sessions. In our own school we have pupils coming from three states, some as far as thirty miles away from the school building, attending regularly. Afternoon attendance, however, where Sunday services are held, interferes with the parents attending divine worship. It is a very difficult task to bring the fathers and mothers to the temple in the morning and have them prepare the children, on return from the temple, to be on time for the afternoon session. The ideal, therefore, should be to hold the school session at the hour of the religious service.

Where there are two rabbis in a congregation, the practicability of this suggestion is obvious. Where there is but one rabbi and Sunday services are held, the Sunday afternoon session will solve many difficulties. Where there are Sabbath morning services only and one rabbi, the Sunday morning Religious School is the best under the conditions.

In the Confirmation Department there should be no difficulty

in bringing the children, one or even two afternoons, in the middle of the week. At fourteen to sixteen years of age, after eight years of instruction preceding, the pupils and parents have, or should have, recognized the value of the instruction given. In that case they will look upon the mid-week afternoon sessions not as a sacrifice, but as a need. In Temple Keneseth Israel we have had no difficulty in bringing upwards of one hundred and fifty children to four classes on Thursday afternoons.

ATTENDANCE: Every school should have a paid or volunteer teacher whose business should be to look after the attendance; to communicate with the parents of absent children, and of those who are habitually late. This teacher should, also, be capable of acting as substitute in case of unforeseen accident or necessity.

A census of all the children of school age, in the congregation, should be made every three years. Knowing what children should be in school, and having one teacher designated to look after the attendance, it will be a simple matter for the rabbi, when required, to get in touch with the parents and, in this way, to bring to school every child that should be there.

RELIGIOUS SERVICE: The religious service should be a part of the Saturday or Sunday sessions. The service should precede the instruction, so that the children will fall into the habit of attending the temple for the purpose of religious worship. Hymn singing and responsive reading should constitute most of the service. In this way, better than in any other, can congregational singing and worship be developed.

A sermonette should be preached at every service. This sermonette should not be a regular sermon revamped. It should be especially prepared for the children's comprehension. It should contain a story, illustrating the lesson of the sermonette, which the children can carry home with them and relate to their parents.

PRIZES: Prizes and medals that have a monetary value should be strictly excluded from the Religious School organization. They only create heartaches, disappointments and jealousies. A standard should be set for distinguished pupils, say ninety per cent. and above, and for meritorious pupils, say eighty per cent. and above.

Distinguished and meritorious cards should be given to those who attain this average in their work. Many pupils can thus be placed on the honor roll. The names should be read in alphabetical order. The striving of the pupils, therefore, will be to attain an excellence in work, in order to obtain honorable mention, not for the value of the medal or the book.

In the Confirmation class the problem of prize-parts and prize-essays is a very difficult one. No matter how we try, there is an unconscious prejudice in favor of certain pupils in the distribution of Confirmation honors. After many experiments, I believe that we have overcome the difficulty. Our pupils must write essays on themes of instruction taught and discussed by the pupils in the class. Certain essays on particular themes are marked by us. Two examinations, in all the subjects taught, are given during the year. At the end of the year the general averages of all the pupils are obtained in the usual way. The parts for the confirmation ceremony are placed on the blackboard and the pupil who attained the highest average has the first choice; the pupil who has the second highest average, the second choice, and so on down the list for every member of the class.

THE OUTING: It is well to give the school an outing at the end of the school year. Parents often accompany the children, and, in this way, create a closer intercourse between teachers, parents and pupils. Athletic games should be arranged and post-confirmants should be placed in charge, under the supervision of the rabbi.

Some may think that the rabbi loses his dignity by participating in these athletic events with the children of the school. The rabbi who is blessed with the attribute of dignity will not lose it while playing with children. Entering into the sports brings the rabbi closer to the children than anything else he can do. Maintaining an even temper through the trials of the day and the exigencies of the games is a moral lesson for the pupil, more effective than can be taught in the classroom. Inter-class games will tend to create class spirit and in cities where there are more than one Religious School, inter-school games will tend to create a school spirit.

THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION: An Alumni Association should be the final step in the ideal Religious School organization. In this association the spirit of the Religious School can be carefully fostered. The Alumni co-operate with the Board of the Congregation in supplying Religious School needs and its active heads may become active assistants in the Religious School work. An annual social affair of some kind, in honor of the Confirmation class, to welcome the confirmants into the Alumni Association, will tend to increase the social life of the congregation and to bring the young people closer together, socially, under the auspices of the Synagogue.

One example of what an Alumni Association may accomplish, if I may be permitted, is that of Keneseth Israel. We have been wanting a separate school building for years. The Keneseth Israel Alumni, organized but two years, has already purchased a lot for \$50,000, and will erect on it, for Religious School and congregational social purposes, a building to cost nearly \$100,000.

I have here given an outline on which an ideal Religious School Organization may be built. Such a school, under such conditions and through such instruction, will not only educate our children to love their religion, but will react upon the parents who, for one reason or another, have neglected it. The average parents are interested in their children's school work and difficulties. If the organization of the Religious School, therefore, is such as to impress the parents with the earnestness of its endeavor, the value of its instruction and the sincerity of its teaching, say through the verbal reports and the character of the lessons that the children bring home after every session, the parents will give heed to the just demands of the Religious School for regularity in attendance and the necessity for home work. The rabbi will find little or no difficulty with the pupils and his personal instruction in the Confirmation and Post-Confirmation classes will attach the young people to him and to the congregation. It will solve the problem that seems to worry some rabbis so much, in that it will educate young people who, knowing and understanding their religion, ap-

preciating their past and pulsating with hopes and ideals for the future, will cling faithfully to the Synagogue and will be forever retained in the fold of Judaism.

K

ABSTRACT OF REMARKS ON POST-BIBLICAL
HISTORIES.

BY DR. JOSEPH STOLZ, Chicago, Ill.

Inasmuch as some of our religious schools do not teach post-biblical history, I shall preface my remarks with a few reasons why this subject should be made an essential part of the curriculum of every liberal religious school, my observations being suggested largely by Mr. Montefiore's thoughtful and inspiring address of last night.

אין לך בן חורין אלא משעוסק בתלמוד תורה Liberalism must be based upon knowledge and not upon convenience. It is the truth that makes us free. The liberal Jew must know more, not less, than the orthodox Jew about the development of his religion. The orthodox Jew has his duties all prescribed and defined for him in the Shulhan Aruk; while the liberal laying claim to the right of selection and rejection must be able to give himself and others adequate reasons for his non-conformity; and for such an intelligent discrimination, a study of post-biblical history is a prerequisite.

A study of post-biblical history will help clarify the mind as to the seeming discrepancy between Judaism as it is portrayed in the Old Testament and as it is practiced in the modern home and temple or synagogue.

It will enable one to fill out for himself the blank page between the Old and New Testaments and not make him dependent upon prejudiced non-Jewish sources for his judgment upon the true relationship of Judaism to early Christianity.

It will make clear that Judaism is a progressive, developing, expanding religion and not a religion bound to any one book; that there may be a Karaitism of the Talmud as well as of the Bible, as Geiger so frequently maintained; that Reform is not a parasitical

growth but a natural development from the past, a legitimate expression of Judaism, in accordance with the demands of the age—knowledge necessary for the passing of an intelligent judgment upon the respective claims of reform and orthodoxy.

It makes for a broader tolerance amongst ourselves, because it will show that there have always been many different complexions and manifestations of Judaism. A careful student of the past will hesitate long ere he make the dogmatic statement that this or that is not Judaism, this or that man is not a Jew; for, Israel has been tolerant of the widest divergence of opinion. The Passover-Haggada tells of the five Rabbis that debated vehemently all night at B'ne B'rak; but when they were reminded that "the time had arrived for the recital of the Shema," they at once realized that, despite all differences of opinion, they were all Jews belonging to the same people and religion.

It instils a new joy in Jewish fellowship. Making us proud of our ancestry, it makes us happy to be with our own people, contented when we can say **בתוך עמי אנכי יושב** brave in bearing prejudice and courageous in facing opposition.

It drives home the lesson that at all times, not only the Rabbi, but also the layman was actively interested in the study of Jewish literature and the promotion of Judaism. Theoretically, there is no Jewish laity; but, in reality, it is becoming, more and more, the practice in our land to entrust the study of Jewish literature and theology to the Rabbi exclusively. And it is to be hoped that the visit to this country of our distinguished guest will not simply strengthen us in our devotion to liberal Judaism, but will also stimulate many of our prominent laymen, who are much devoted to the philanthropic problems of Israel, to feel that it is a duty, privilege and distinction to be interested also in the theology and literature of Israel.

And now as to the text-books on post-biblical history. At our last Conference the critics seemed to take special delight in denouncing every text-book that has ever been written for our religious schools—a policy not calculated to encourage men and women to devote themselves to this difficult and holy task. I prefer to speak the encouraging word that might stimulate the willing and

competent to prepare the necessary material for our schools, whether it be through the medium of text-books or of Young Israel.

As far as I know, the oldest text-book on post-biblical prepared for schools in this country was Dr. Max Lilienthal's translation and adaptation of some German book. Then Dr. Sigmund Hecht wrote a book in which he described certain interesting periods and personalities, not so much for the purpose of teaching consecutive history as with the intention of stimulating interest in our past. Lady Magnus's Outline of Jewish History was written with much love and enthusiasm, but frequently it substitutes verbose and rhapsodical descriptions for a concrete recital of facts and events. Our industrious, zealous and competent colleague, Dr. Maurice Harris, has brought his People of the Book up-to-date, by the publication of his two carefully prepared and illustrated booklets entitled A Thousand Years of Jewish History, and Modern Jewish History, which I trust some one will discuss who has had the pleasure of using them in his school; even as I hope that Dr. Deutsch will inform us about his History of the Jews, which is now in press. Let me, in conclusion, commend to you heartily the Story of the Jewish People, by Jack Myers, a nicely printed, well bound and illustrated book which I used this year with great pleasure in a class of high-school pupils. In a vivid, interesting style, it describes the inner life and culture of the people from the time of the Maccabees to the close of the Mishuah, and it is especially valuable because of the many interesting topics of discussion it suggests to the informed teacher, calculated to throw light upon modern institutions of Judaism. In my opinion, it might have improved the usefulness of the book, if the author had dwelt somewhat more at length upon the political background of the period, had said more about the Halacha, and had given more attention to the origin of Christianity—a subject which, as Mr. Montefiore has well divined, is bound to give the Jews more and more concern. At all events, in the study of history, it is always advantageous to have more than one text-book in the hands of a class, both for the purpose of comparing facts and of supplementing knowledge.

L

INSTRUCTION IN JEWISH HISTORY.

BY PROF. GOTTHARD DEUTSCH, Cincinnati, Ohio.

There can be no difference between Jewish and any other history, except in regard to the object. The method must be that of all other historic research and presentation.

History means a systematic presentation of important facts, i. e., all facts, influencing the development of human civilization.

In order to present these facts properly, we must first have them, and in this respect we meet with two difficulties; firstly, are the facts which our sources report to us correct, and secondly, do we understand them properly?—for the dry fact, no matter how exactly recorded as to time and locality, is not yet history.

Jewish history has to cope with two additional difficulties. One is that up to modern times it usually gives us incoherent facts, scattered both as to time and space, and thus lacks chronological sequence, indispensable to a consecutive history, and secondly it extends over almost every civilized country of the world, and therefore is particularly exacting for the student who has to know the details of the history of that particular country or time, with which his Jewish subject is connected.

A systematic presentation of facts, we call history, because it is quite clear that without this, the mere enumeration of facts is at best a chronological list, a mere source of history, but not history itself. In this, as in all cases, I shall take my illustration from Jewish history. Suppose we were to record in the style of annals that Elijah Levita, in the year 1538, published a book on the Masorah entitled, "Masoret Ha-Masoret." This is an absolutely well established fact, but as such is meaningless. Even if we add that this book deals with the origin of the Hebrew vowel points and accents and come to the conclusion that these were not invented

until the sixth century, the explanation would only be an attempt at history. It becomes history, when we add that the Renaissance movement, whose beginnings we may trace back to the thirteenth century, had for its subject the critical examination of generally accepted theories, and thus led to a kind of intellectual revolution against authority; that this revolution was largely instrumental in bringing about the church reformation in the sixteenth century, and that just at that time Elijah Levita of Neustadt an der Arsch, who was living in Italy, engaged in literary work and in teaching Hebrew grammar to Christians. He came in contact with leading representatives of the Renaissance movement and became imbued with its spirit and applied it to Jewish traditions. We would then add that at the very same time, when criticism made its first timid infant steps, we see on the other hand the consolidation of authority, making its appearance in the compilation of the *Schulhan Aruk* by Joseph Caro, the first edition of which was printed in Venice in 1564. We might further add that Caro, whose highest aim it was to compress the whole Jewish religion into an unchangeable code of ritual laws, was at the same time in close touch with a mystic circle in Safed, the head of which, Isaac Luria, preached and practiced an emotionalism, which, while not conscious of its antagonism to ritualistic religion, was all the same destined to seriously menace its existence.

In this way three dry facts, meaningless in themselves, namely—Elijah Levita published his book on the *Masorah* in 1538 in Venice, Joseph Caro published his code of laws, *Shulhan Aruk*, also in Venice in 1564, and Isaac Luria, the *Cabbalist*, died at Safed, March 15, 1573—receive their significance. We see how naive faith is shaken on one hand by criticism and on the other hand simultaneously is strengthened by mysticism. It is, however, exceedingly difficult to present such real history to young pupils, for it would require that they know something about Hebrew orthography, something about the Renaissance, something about the Reformation, about mysticism and ritualism, and very often about things we take for granted they do know, while they do not; and thus we are in danger of falling into the greatest evil of pedagogy which consists in making the pupil repeat statements which he does not understand,

thus stunting his mind instead of developing it, as well as the moral danger lying in the habit of untruthfulness, thus engendered.

In order to present facts systematically and intelligently, we must first have them. History, however, has in every instance, as its raw material, not facts, but reports of facts. In each instance we have to examine these reports as to their correctness. As a particularly strong illustration I wish to quote an experience often met with. In a newspaper, which is a source of undoubted contemporary character, the date of a death is given differently in two places of the same issue.¹ I am fully conscious that this illustration will be a find for the scoffer, who is wont to say that history is a hickering about trivial facts that are of no consequence to anybody. It is for this reason that I quote this instance, because the sneer merely shows how inconvenient the insistence on clear facts is to people who like to talk in vague generalities, and in ambiguous or altogether obscure technical terms, and prefer the very convenient work of general criticism, critical appreciation and presentation, and bombastic platitudes about spiritual life and aims and fears and what not.

My contention is this: If a contemporary source can commit an error as to one easily ascertainable fact, how justified is our suspicion of facts which are many years behind us? If one may err as to one day, why not as to one century, and I am in a position to prove my statement by any number of instances which I have collected. One shall suffice. Zunz,² whose conscientiousness and marvellous accuracy are the object of admiration for every student, records the death of Rabbi Israel Lipschuetz, of Danzig, as having occurred in 1760. The difference is fully a century for Israel Lipschuetz died September 19, 1860. There may be some who would consider this as indifferent, but Israel Lipschuetz presents a literary class, which, if found a hundred years before, would change our whole view of the Jewish spiritual life at that period. Lipschuetz wrote a commentary on the Mishnah, which is plainly exegetical

¹The death of Rabbi Michael Silberstein of Wiesbaden is reported in *Allg. Zeitung des Judentums*, 1910, No. 42, in one place as having taken place Oct. 13, in another place Oct. 14.

²*Die Monatstages des Kalenderjahres*, Berlin, 1872, p. 51.

and employs good German in the translation of certain terms. In the eighteenth century we find no such instance amongst the German rabbis. Furthermore the son of Israel Lipschuetz, Baruch, wrote a religious book in German with German characters.³ Had his father died in 1760, the literary activity of the son would have fallen in the latter part of the eighteenth century, and again, a rabbi, writing on religious subjects in German, and employing German characters, would be a unique phenomenon. If we were not better informed on that period, this would lead us to believe that the religious attitude and intellectual life of the Jews at that period were entirely different from what we know them now to have been.

The next point is that of a proper interpretation of undoubted facts. In order to understand this problem, we must first take another instance of an established fact. For many years all Jewish histories gave a prominent place to the report that Charlemagne called Rabbi Kalonymos of Lucca to Mayence, and made him chief rabbi of the Jews of Germany. Graetz⁴ records this as a fact and adds to it the interpretation that Charlemagne, brilliant statesman that he was, understood the value of the Jews as agents of commerce and understood further that they would not feel at home, unless their spiritual life was properly taken care of. Here the historian puts an interpretation on the fact. Not wishing to go into tedious details, I merely point to a criticism of this report,⁵ which seems absolutely incontrovertible. I might add that this report is found first in sources of the sixteenth century, which makes the fact already suspicious, and furthermore we do not find for nearly 700 years a similar fact, and if we look upon it in the light in which Graetz views it, the idea of the government taking measures to properly develop the spiritual life of Judaism, we must go down to the eighteenth century, before we find an analogy. In the fifteenth century we do find two well attested reports of chief rabbis of the German empire appointed by emperors. The first is the

³Torat Shemuel. Ein Erbaumingsbuch fur Israeliten. Hamburg, 1867.

⁴Geschichte, vol. V, p. 182-183, 3d ed.

⁵Zeitschrift fur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, vol. ii., p. 82.

case of Israel of Krems,⁶ 1407, and the second that of Anselm of Cologne, in 1435.⁷ We would, however, be very far from the truth, were we to believe that it was the desire of these emperors, when making these appointments, to look after the spiritual welfare of their Jewish subjects. The matter was entirely different. In the course of the thirteenth century, the German emperors, by engaging in fantastic schemes of restoring the old Roman world empire under German rule had lost control of their nearest task. The feudal system grew stronger and stronger and the German empire became a loose federation with a monarch who was very much at the mercy of the territorial rulers. The latter coveted power and therefore tried to obtain as much as possible control of the federal resources. One of the most profitable objects of taxation were the Jews. The emperor in his political difficulties by and by yielded his right to tax the Jews, which was originally a federal prerogative. First to the Dukes of Austria,⁸ 1331, in order that they should recognize him and relinquish the claim of their own house, then to any number of other princes, bishops, abbots, and free cities. Thus in the beginning of the 15th century, when the imperial treasury was very hard pressed for funds, the subject of taxing the Jews presented itself, and as the territorial lords naturally wished to put all the taxes that could be squeezed out of the Jews, into their own coffers, the emperor, still claiming his prerogative to be the overlord of all Jews of the world, appointed a chief rabbi of all the Jews, who should assist him to collect taxes from the Jews in spite of the territorial lords. Thus the matter, which at first sight is considered a step taken in the interest of the Jews, dissolves itself into a fiscal measure.

The particular difficulty in Jewish history lies, as I said, in the incoherence of the reported facts. Jews had been living in the Roman province of Gaul very likely long before the invasion of the Franks. If there were no other proofs for it, we might infer it

⁶Graetz, viii, 102, 3d ed. Allg. Zeitung d. Judt. 1862, 193d seq. Frankl-Guin; J. K., i. 14. Breslau, 1896.

⁷Graetz. Gesch. viii, 137, 3d ed. Gudemann: Erziehungswesen, III, 36, 265-267, Vienna, 1888.

⁸Scherer: Rechtsverhältnisse der Juden in den deutsch-österreich. Ländern, p. 357-362, Leipsic, 1901.

from the bitter hatred which the tourist, Rutilius Namatianus⁹ shows in his Latin poem, in which he describes his journey to Italy (†16). Still all we hear of the Jews in France down to the ninth century is a prohibition of various church councils against the social intercourse of Jews with Christians,¹⁰ a little anecdote-like incident reported by Bishop Gregory of Tours about the Jew, Priscus, who was a favorite of King Hilperic,¹¹ a few legal enactments of Charlemagne,¹² some of which, like the formula of oath, exceedingly suspicious, a few specimens of passports issued to Jews by Louis le Debonaire,¹³ an order of the same king transferring the market days to Sunday in order to accommodate the Jews,¹⁴ a fact not at all surprising in those ante-Puritan days, a case of a Jew serving as physician in ordinary to King Charles III¹⁵ and two venomous anti-Jewish clerics, the Bishops Agobard, and Amolo of Lyons.¹⁶ In Germany the condition is still worse. There we have no ascertained fact from the fourth century in which Constantine issues two edicts regarding the Jews of Cologne¹⁷ until nearly the tenth century.¹⁸ Certainly some things must have happened which are worth while knowing, but they have not been preserved.

How much better are we off in modern French history, when we look upon the significance of the Dreyfus case. We can trace it back to the beginnings of the French Revolution. We know now that the emancipation of the Jews in France in 1791, the first case of its kind on the European continent, was in part the work of doctrinaires, who used to ignore the forces of history and in part

⁹Poetae latini minores, iv, 133, ed. Wernsdorf, Paris, 1825.

¹⁰Graetz, *Gesch.* v, 44, 3d ed.

¹¹Ibid., p. 50.

¹²Ibid., 181-185; Gudemann: *Erziehungswesen*, ii. 12.

¹³De Rozieres: *Recuerb general des formules etc.* i. 41-43, Paris, 1859-1871. Simson: *Jahrbuch des frankischen Reichs*, i., 393-396.

¹⁴Graetz, v., 206, 3d ed.

¹⁵Ibid., 221.

¹⁶Ibid., 209-221.

¹⁷Aronius: *Registen zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, No. 2, Berlin, 1893.

¹⁸Gresebrecht: *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i., 849, 4 ed. Leipsic, 1881, *Zeitschrift. fur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, i., 157, ii., 82.

an intrigue, which expected to thus undermine the power of the Jacobin radicals. Count Mirabeau, in his secret report to the king advised the sanction of the emancipation of the Jews, because in connection with other radical measures it would so arouse the loyal and bigoted country population that the power of the Jacobins would be broken.¹⁹ Queen Marie Antoinette, with that traditional bigoted hatred of the Jews, which she had inherited from her mother, writes to one of her ladies in waiting that the emancipation of the Jews certainly made the measure full and that God would surely visit this terrible crime on its perpetrators.²⁰ Feudalism and clericalism have never changed in this attitude as we can see so impressively in Anatole France's fine sarcasm in his novel "*L'An-neau d'Amethyste*."²¹ The third republic was by both these classes considered only a temporary necessity, when Napoleon's empire collapsed in consequence of the battle of Sedan. They expected the return of the "Roy" every day, but on the other hand the liberals with Gambetta in the lead, advocated the separation of state and church. The opportunity for the clericals seemed to have come after the exposure of the shameful corruption in connection with the Panama Canal, 1892. A convenient scapegoat was here, as always, the Jew. Even when the Bastille fell, 1789, attacks on the Jews in Alsace began. The same was true, when the July revolution broke out, 1830. Now, 1894, it seemed handy to start an anti-Jewish agitation which would bring the long expected opportunity for the combined forces of feudal aristocracy and clergy to overthrow the republic. Republican statesmen were afraid of this movement and sacrificed the innocent army officer. This explains the farcical outcome of the second trial at Rennes, 1899. Perhaps this trial would never have had its sequel of 1906, had not Leo XIII, the diplomat, on the throne of St. Peter, been succeeded, 1903, by Pius X, who by his uncompromising policy forced the battle with the result that it was lost for Rome and that clericalism showed its weakness, which finally brought the opportunity for the vindication of Drey-

¹⁹Correspondance entre le comte de Mirabeau et le comte de la Marek, ii., 374-377; Oncken: *Zeitalter du Revolution*, i., 340.

²⁰Allg. Zeitung des Judentums, 1864, p. 699.

²¹Paris, 1899.

fus. Here we can trace up the anti-Jewish agitation in its historic connections for more than a century; in the case of Agobard we can not.

Another difficulty peculiar to Jewish history is the wide scattering of the Jewish people and consequently the necessity of familiarizing ourselves with all details of local history. In 1858 a crime, as stupid and revolting as ever perpetrated by brutality, posing as religion, startled the whole civilized world. Edgar Mortara, of Bologna, a child, then six years old, was taken from the home of his parents and brought to a convent, where he was educated for the priesthood, because a former domestic of the family had claimed in the confession to her priest that a few years previously she had baptized him. Here, by the way, we can see the importance of chronological exactness, for a year later this outrageous act could not have been perpetrated, because Bologna was no more part of the papal states. The main point of interest, however, lies not merely in the geographical situation, but in the act as part of the policy of Pius IX, who since 1848 adopted the principle of using every possible opportunity to defy public opinion. The church wished to emphasize its adherence to mediæval principles, and the abduction of the child Mortara was one link in the chain of manifestations which found their expression in the publication of the syllabus of 1864, and in the declaration of papal infallibility in 1870. In order to clearly understand this situation, we therefore have to know the territorial history of Italy in the nineteenth century. Similarly we have to explain the marvelous growth of the community of Leghorn on the basis of the same conditions. Italy, split up into many petty countries, each of which rivaled with the other for supremacy, was like Germany, a country from which Jews were never totally expelled. When one ruler yielded to religious fanaticism, his neighbor was ready to prepare a home for the exiles. The duke of Tuscany, jealous of the commercial success of the Republic of Genoa, was anxious to draw the trade to the port of Leghorn. He therefore opened his seat to the refugees from the Spanish Inquisition without troubling the new settlers

²²Allg. Zeitung des Judentums, 1889, pp. 402-405.

with regard to their past. Shortly before 1573 the papal Nuncio, at the court of Savoy, had brought charges against the officials who allowed Maranos, whom the canonical law considered apostates from Christianity, to live in Turin as Jews.²² After some attempts to deny the allegation the Duke of Savoy, who needed the friendship of the Pope, had to yield. Leghorn, therefore, furnished a convenient city of refuge to the victims of persecution, whose number was soon increased by merchants from various parts of Italy, and very likely from Morocco also.²³ The wealthy community attracted scholars, as rich Jews considered it their duty to support a Beth Hamidrash, and the next step was the establishment of a well furnished printing office, which in turn attracted authors from various parts of the world.

Similar were the conditions which led to the establishment of printing offices in some German cities. Sovereigns of small states considered it important enough for the promotion of industry to allow Hebrew printing in their territories, which gave to working men occupation, and opened a market to local paper mills. Such was the case in Sulzbach where the Markgrave gave permission for the opening of a Hebrew publishing house,²⁴ which in many parts of Germany met with considerable difficulty on account of the strict censorship. A wealthy patron of Jewish literature was the court Jew, Moses Benjamin Wolff, who as a favorite of the Duke of Dessau, could establish a printing office in that city and in two other cities of the same state.²⁵ To the influence of another court Jew, Behrend Lehmann, was due the publication of the first Talmud edition printed in Germany.²⁶ It was just at the same time, 1712, when a storm broke out against Talmudic literature on account of its supposed hostility to Christianity, and when the Jesuits in Bohemia, who practically controlled the administration of the country, had raided Jewish houses and synagogues for the purpose of

²²Jewish Encyclopedia, article: Leghorn.

²⁴Weinberg: Die hebraischen Druckereien in Sietzbach, *Jahrbuch der Judisch-Liter. Gesellschaft*, 1903-5664, p. 19. 202 Frankfurt a. m. 1903.

²⁵Freudenthal: *Aus der Heimat Mendelssohns*. Leipzig, 1900, p. 155 et seq.

²⁶*Monatsschrift für Geschichte u Wissenschaft des Judentums*, Vol. 42, p. 80, et seq., 1898.

seizing such books.²⁷ Thus, the battle near Prague of 1620 and the subsequent counter-reformation has its considerable influence on Jewish learning, and the politics of Tuscany as well as the economic theories of the Markgrave of Sulzbach are factors in Jewish history.

Having thus seen how the external condition of the Jews is dependent on the details of European politics, we must study the spiritual movements of the time in connection with social and political conditions in order to understand the thought currents in Jewish religion. We have already seen how Renaissance influenced Jewish thought in the case of Elijah Levita. It is not quite correct when Graetz²⁸ says that the only influence of Reformation on Judaism was that the factions within the Christian church, being occupied with internal contentions, had no time to trouble the Jews. We see clearly in a letter of Landgrave Wilhelm IV, of Hesse, to his brother Ludwig, a refutation of this assertion. Nigrinus, a pastor in the latter's territory, had published a book under the significant title, "Der Judenfeind," Giessen, 1570, and Landgrave Wilhelm expresses his indignation in a letter to his brother, because if such theories were correct the "Papists" would have a perfect right to declare that they must not tolerate Protestants in their dominion.²⁹ The broader spirit, which was the result of the Reformation makes itself felt in Judaism in a phenomenon like that of Uriel Acosta with his deistic views, but difficult as it is to trace external facts to their source, it is still more difficult to trace opinions to the source from which they came. Human psychology is a complex thing, and it is almost impossible to analyze exactly the causes of our thoughts. The difficulty becomes greater, when the times are remote from ours, and when the expressions are so vague that they admit of various interpretations. A modern instance will clearly illustrate this statement. In 1863 Graetz published in the "Jahrbuch fuer Israeliten," edited by Leopold Kompert in Vienna, Vol. X, an essay "Die Verjungung des Juedischen

²⁷Steinschneider: Hebr. Bibliographie VI, 35-39; Monatschrift f. G. u. W. d. j., Vol. 41, pp. 359-360; Vol. 42, p. 181.

²⁸Geschichte, IX, 196, 3d ed.

²⁹Allg. Zeitung des Judentums, 1856, p. 253.

Stames" in which he maintained that the servant of the Lord in Israel was the people of Israel. In this essay he stated with an easily intelligible allusion that Judaism did not teach a "thorn-crowned Messiah." Austria was at that time in the throes of a liberal regeneration while officially the Concordat of 1855 was still in force. The champion of clericalism, still fighting the battle for the retention of its supremacy, was the priest Sebastian Brunner, whose paper, "Wiener Katholische Kirchenzeitung" tried to prop up the shaky edifice of clericalism by constant attacks on the Jews. The diplomatic advocate of mediævalism found it inconvenient to demand proceedings against Graetz as author and Kompert as publisher for having attacked a dogma of the Christian church. This would have been considered a revival of the Inquisition. He therefore cleverly demanded prosecution of this paper on the ground that it had derided the Jewish church by ridiculing the belief in a personal Messiah, which was one of the essential dogmas of Judaism. The public prosecutor, Eduard Lienbacher, a clerical politician, willingly came to his assistance. In the trial Isaac Noah Mannheimer and Lazar Horwitz, rabbis of Vienna, were summoned to testify as experts on this point. Both declined to serve as cat's-paws for a clerical intrigue. For Mannheimer, as a liberal, it was easy to state that the belief in a personal Messiah was not an essential dogma of Judaism; for Horwitz, an orthodox, who was a disciple of Moses Sofer, and a great-grandson of Rabbi Phineas Horwitz of Frankfurt am Main, the determined opponent of the Mendelssohnian movement, this was difficult. He extricated himself, however, both skillfully and honestly, by the declaration that, while he believed in a personal Messiah and was of the opinion that it was a dogma of Judaism, he could not deny that there were prominent teachers of Judaism who taught otherwise. This declaration furnished to Israel Hildesheimer, then rabbi of Eisenstadt, an opportunity for a protest movement, in which Horwitz was accused of having wilfully misrepresented Judaism. The discussion was carried on in newspapers and pamphlets and amongst those who participated prominently in it was Hirsch B. Fassel, a Talmudist of the old type, who had the peculiar hobby of supporting Reform with dialectical arguments from rabbinical literature.

He claimed that his teacher Moses Sofer, a man of unquestionable orthodoxy, had declared that the belief in a Personal Messiah was not essential.³⁰ The fact is a half truth, and therefore one of the most dangerous kinds of misrepresentation. Moses Safer, a bitter opponent of everything modern, condemns catechisms and in the course of his argument condemns even Maimonides for having drafted a set of fundamental dogmas. To Moses Sofer nothing can be fundamental, because nothing in the Jewish faith is indifferent. If one, so he argues, would deny that Balaam's ass spoke, he denies a fact, stated in the Torah, and with this denies a truth of divine revelation. In this connection, he further says that even the belief in Messiah can not be considered an essential dogma, for if God were to change his mind, and were to determine that Israel should for ever live in exile, this would not in the least exempt us from observing the divine commandments.³¹ We see, therefore, that while the quotation is correct, the meaning of the quotation in the context is exactly the opposite of what Fassel makes his teacher say. Suppose, however, that instead of having the statement of Moses Sofer in its context, we would possess merely the passage quoted by Fassel, such as we have always in Talmudic literature, would we not be led to present Moses Sofer as a liberal who was far in advance of his age? As an illustration in point, we might quote the statement of Samuel, the Babylonian Amora of the third century, who says there is no difference between our age and that of the Messiah except that Israel will enjoy political independence.³² Who will now determine, whether Samuel meant to say that there will be no bodily resurrection or that even in Messianic times the evils of society, sickness, death, poverty, and injustice will prevail as heretofore?

If we were to follow the method of Fassel, we could easily prove that one of the most prominent leaders of modern Talmudic orthodoxy, Isaac Elhanan of Kovno, was a radical of radicals, for he clearly says³³ that in our age of telegraph and newspaper, the Tal-

³⁰Ben Chananjah.

³¹Hatam Sofer, Yoreh Deah, No. 356.

³²Berakot, 34, b.

³³En Yizhak, p. 230, Wilna, 1888.

mudic laws are not applicable. Certainly, however, nothing was farther from Isaac Elhanan's mind than to have this statement applied to Sabbath or dietary laws or even to the system of education. He makes this statement in connection with one particular case. One of the victims of the catastrophe of the steamship, "Austria," which was lost at sea in 1858, had left a widow and according to strict Talmudic law the widow could not marry because the man who was lost in this disaster might have found refuge in a remote island, from which he could not communicate with the outside world. This, the rabbi says, is not applicable to our time. He evidently was guided by a humane idea which would make it appear cruel that a woman should be condemned to lifelong widowhood, if the Talmudic law were strictly applied. How can we, to cite a Talmudic analogy, claim that Rabbi Simeon ben Johai was a liberal, because in regard to some Sabbath law he gives a lenient decision?⁸⁴ How could we conclude with Graetz⁸⁵ and I. H. Weiss⁸⁶ that Rabbi Judah Hanasi was a liberal, because he declared himself against some of the rigorous laws of the Sabbathical year?

We must further not forget the great difficulty presented to us in our old rabbinical literature, when we do not know the personal relations of the teachers, whose views are recorded. In a report⁸⁷ full of legends we are told that Eliezer ben Hyrkanos was excommunicated by his brother-in-law, Gamaliel. We know that the various miracles told in this connection, as the moving of the sycamore tree, the turning of the water up hill, and the inclining of the walls of the Beth Hamidrash can not have taken place to prove the truth of Eliezer's statement. It would only be an evasion of the question were we to adopt Graetz's⁸⁸ method, who said that people in those days believed to have heard a divine voice which decided in favor of Eliezer. We are also hardly willing to admit that the ex-communication took place on the ground of a trivial controversy in ritual law, as is reported in Talmud. My

⁸⁴Weiss: *Dor Dor*, etc., ii, 157.

⁸⁵*Geschichte*, IV, 201, 3d ed.

⁸⁶*Dor Dor*, etc., ii, 179.

⁸⁷*Baba Mezia*, 59, b.

⁸⁸*Geschichte*, IV, 31, 3d ed.

view has been expressed elsewhere³⁹ that Eliezer was condemned for certain anti-ritualistic or spiritualizing views, which were a leaning towards Christianity. I still hold this view in spite of Schuerer's⁴⁰ objections, but whatever may have been behind it nobody can tell, whether some domestic difficulty between these two brothers-in-law had not something to do with their dispute. Similarly the Talmud reports some very disparaging remarks on Rabba Bar Abbahu, the father-in-law of Nahman, and of the latter's learned wife, Yalta. When Rabba is reported as having confessed his ignorance,⁴¹ and Yalta is reported as having broken everything to pieces in her pantry, because she was not allowed the privilege of the cup of blessing,⁴² we may see in the report the ill-will of the rival school of Pumbeditha, which looked askance at the fame of its older sister, Nahardea, over which Nahman presided.

We have been used to look upon the controversy between Jacob Emden and Jonathan Eybeschuetz as a fight on the extent to which Kabbala may be tolerated. Up to a certain degree this is correct, but we have conclusive evidence through the memoirs of Jacob Emden, that he considered himself wronged by the election of Eybeschuetz to the rabbinate to which he considered himself—and in my opinion was—far more entitled.⁴³ Jair Bacharach wrote a scathing criticism of the Haggadah, commentary of his predecessor, Rabbi Aaron Teominus of Worms, a specimen of the degeneracy of rabbinic dialecticism, in the seventeenth century,⁴⁴ and it is true that elsewhere Bacharach shows a better appreciation of sound methods than his contemporaries. Still it is very unlikely that his wounded feelings at the election of another man as successor of his father and grandfather to the rabbinate of Worms were altogether no party to his disgust at Teominus' work.

It is obvious that such details can not be taught even in an ad-

³⁹Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, VI. p. 157, Cincinnati, 1897.

⁴⁰Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes, ii, 372, 3d ed.

⁴¹Baba Mezia, 114, b.

⁴²Berakot, 51, b.

⁴³Megillat Sefer. pp. 209, Warsaw, 1896.

⁴⁴Bikkurim, ed. by Naphtali Keller, i, 4-26, Vienna, 1865.

vanced class of our religious schools. We can not expect pupils of such a school to know enough about Hebrew grammar to understand the difference between the biliteral and the triliteral theory. We can not even anticipate that they are acquainted sufficiently with the territorial history of Italy to know, why Jews were expelled from Sicily and permitted to settle in Leghorn. We can not burden their minds with the theories of political economy which made it possible for Jewish financiers of the seventeenth century to rise to prominence. What we can do seems to be limited entirely to a treatment of history by the presentation of prominent biographies and of certain periods which bring out the noble sacrifice of the Jew for the cause of his religion and finally by such literary phenomena that can be grasped by any student, having at best little more than primary school education.

M

DISCUSSION BY MR. CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN: That I am put up to speak at all is partly due, I fear, to weakness, and partly to laziness. Our chairman of this morning, Rabbi Gries, wrote to me some little time ago asking whether I would write a paper to be read at this Conference, on this subject. I felt unable to do that partly through lack of knowledge, and partly also because a real movement in any sense in religious education has not come within my experience. The lines of my life have been such that I have never had to do anything practical in religious teaching, and therefore from a practical point of view know but very little about it. When I wrote to Dr. Gries he wrote back saying if I would not write a paper he hoped I would at all events join or open a discussion, and he said he would assume that I would do so if I did not reply. Well, I did not reply, partly because there was one letter less I had to write by not replying, due to laziness, and possibly also I thought it would be perhaps churlish to say no the second time. So it is just my laziness or weakness which causes me to be put up this morning to open the discussion of this subject.

But one thing I am really glad to be able to say right away: The writer of the paper, Rabbi Landman, who was kind enough to let me read it last night, or this morning rather, spoke about the dingy, dark rooms in cellars and basements, which are to be found in some synagogues. While I have only been in a few towns in the United States, and have visited only I suppose the most important congregations of those towns, nevertheless I have seen some of these underground rooms. But I can not describe them as defective or dingy, as compared with the rooms of our organizations in England—for synagogue classes and for Sunday-Schools, whatever you may call it. I am bound to say that you in America do carry

away the palm. And also as regards the whole organization; I have been very much struck in speaking to rabbi after rabbi here since I have been in America, to find out how complete the system of religious education seems to be in connection with the various synagogues. I do not say that we have not caught some of the spirit of religious education, and of Sabbath-Schools, in England, but I think I may say without fear of contradiction from any Jewish English brother that we have not so complete a system nor such a careful organization extending over so many years from the earliest age, away up to the late confirmation age, and even extending to the post-confirmation classes, and to the alumni organizations of which we have heard. And just as I would congratulate Liberal Judaism, in the abstract, if I may congratulate it, on the possession of so fine a body of interpreters and ministers as I see before me to-day, and as I have seen in the States, so I would venture to congratulate it on this admirable development of religious teaching, which obviously is a most scientific part of our religious life. I shall take back to my country a description and memory of what goes on here as regards the religious teaching and the religious classes, and I earnestly hope, if we are able to start a liberal congregation in England, we shall be able to copy, with, of course, due regard to different conditions and circumstances, something of your system of Sunday or Sabbath-School, and of your post-confirmation classes and your alumni associations. I would like to make one remark, with regard to the day of confirmation which has been alluded to by Rabbi Landman in his paper. In England practically the whole of confirmation has been confined almost exclusively to my own congregation, or the reform congregation of which I spoke last night, which instituted at once as an important feature of its work the rite and practice of confirmation, both of boys and girls, something unheard of in the 40's, when our synagogue was established. But that confirmation ceremony has always been held, either on the Saturday of Shabouth or for some years upon Sunday afternoon but it has never been held on the Festival itself, although there have been some opinions expressed from time to time that it might be desirable to put it upon that day. One reason which of course obtains in England, which does not obtain

in this country for holding it on the Sunday afternoon is that the custom of driving on the Sabbath or on the holidays, is not—well, is not frequent, at all events is not regarded as regularly permitted even by the reform congregations. And it was found that it was difficult for the young girls to come in their white frocks on the Saturday afternoon because that was very often wet and they became bedraggled. Therefore it was put to Sunday afternoon, when they could come in carriages. Perhaps you might not think it out of place if I were to say that I attended confirmation exercises at Dr. Krauskopf's temple the other day, and I was struck by the service in a great many ways. One was by the extreme patience and reverence of the congregation. It was really very delightful to see such perfect reverence. There was no talking, such as we sometimes have, even in synagogues in London. But I use the word patience in a somewhat humorous sense, as they were compelled to sit through a long service lasting over three hours. What further struck me about the service was this, there was very little of Shabouth, and the confirmation exercises seemed to entirely drive out, because of exigencies of time, all those parts of the service which to me were characteristic of the Pentecostal ceremony.

Perhaps I might be allowed to make one or two references with regard to what has been said about text books. First of all as regards the post-biblical text books. I am sure that my friend Mr. Myers will be exceedingly pleased when he hears, as he certainly shall hear from me, the kindly way in which Dr. Stolz spoke about his book. I am very glad to hear him speak so well of it. Mr. Myers will be all the more glad to hear me, because he is in bad health, and I am sure it would encourage him in the work, and perhaps hearten him to go on with the second volume of the book. Mr. Myers has had no means of professional school training or any large measure of scholarship or learning, but has had very great experience in religious schools, especially in schools for the poor, and therefore he came equipped, in the writing of that book, with very special knowledge. And I am glad that special knowledge has been put to such good use. I feel myself we still do have a need, in spite of Mr. Myers' book, and in spite of other books to which allusion has been made, of a further good book in regard to

post-biblical history. Although Professor Deutsch stated his book will not be directly useful for Sabbath-Schools, I am in great hopes, and undoubtedly it will be very useful and will be able to be filtered down for Sabbath-School use. I have found one great difficulty on the subject, viz., that so much of the post-biblical history seems remote to the children when they bring it before them. That seems to be one of the difficulties, and I only want to mention that difficulty because it is possible somebody here may still prepare a further text book. Again, there is so much of post-biblical history, which is of a mournful and painful kind; the story of persecution, the story of exile, and of horrors which in some respects seems to be unsuited to our children; that is what has been put before me by some practical teachers. I do not know how far that has come before the teachers in America. Of course, the ordinary child, in its environment, learns necessarily about the ordinary things of European or American history, and he grows up, as Professor Deutsch explains, within the very processes of his environment. But the Jewish history seems remote to him, and it does need a particular kind of scholar which I do not think as yet has come forward to bring it properly within the child's needs.

And I want to allude to the question of the Bible. I hoped that possibly the writer of the last paper, Rabbi Landman, would have said something as to how in the religious schools, the Bible is practically taught to the children. We have found in England, I think, a certain difficulty with regard to teaching the Bible from a literary point of view, I myself attempted in my "Bible for Home Reading," to give some sort of help to teachers in that respect, but to tell the honest truth, as I look back on the book so far, I don't think the attempt has been very successful. It seems to me in that book as I look at it now objectively, as if written by somebody else, I rather wonder I did not take quite decisive lines; I don't know as it is possible to do so; I don't know at what age it is possible to touch upon questions of miracle, the questions of the less good parts of the Bible, or the more good parts of the Bible. To some extent I attempted to do that in the first part of my book, but as I say, as I look back upon it, I do not feel satisfied with the results, and yet I confess I have not come to any definite conclu-

sion as to how it should be done. And so when the publishers asked me, as reprints have been demanded, whether I wanted to revise the whole book, or special chapters, I answered that I did not want to do so for the very reason that I did not feel I was fully prepared yet as to how it ought and should be revised.

As regards religious teaching altogether from the religious point of view, I think the story will be interesting to you as told me by a dear friend in England, and he is the father of two or three, I do not know how many, children. He said: "You know my views are practically the same as yours, and when I read your manifesto, I find I am entirely in accord with you, but as regards my children, I should not like to teach them at all on those lines. My children I intend to teach exactly as I was taught myself." "So then," I said, "You mean to teach your children what you do not yourself now believe?" He said, "Yes, if you will put it like that, I do. I think on the whole that is right, and the only possible way of approaching and dealing with the subject." I ventured to join issue with him, so much so that in the excitement and enthusiasm of the moment, I began another book (I don't know as it will ever come to anything), which is to be a presentation of Judaism from the liberal point of view for parents and children, just as my "Bible" is supposed to be a presentation of the Bible for parents and children. But if there is to be any further discussion, I should be very glad, and very interested, to know how you practical teachers, you rabbis who superintend and teach and arrange the working of your Sunday classes, do tackle this question; that is to say, of gradually bringing the children to the presentation of liberal Judaism as regards such questions as the miracles, as regards such questions as inspiration, and such parts of the Bible which we now think to be not inspired at all, even from a moral and religious point of view to represent the low level, or lower level of culture and truth, and also with regard to critical questions. That would be of great interest to me, and valuable to me, to report to my friends in England.

I do not know, gentlemen, that I have anything that I can usefully say to you, except that I would like to emphasize how entirely I agree with the remarks which Rabbi Landman made on the subject of prizes in religious schools. I have long felt that the prizes

which still go on in our religious schools in London are extremely out of place. Perhaps it is because I have been brought strongly under the influence of some distinguished and noble rabbis, but be that as it may, whether it is influence or not, I do feel in the religious school there should be no prizes, that is to say, no prizes which are in any sense competitive prizes. A prize which means to gain a certain number of marks, a certain percentage, that is all very well, but a prize which can only be gained by some one, which can not be gained by the others, it seems to me in religious schools is entirely out of place.

I do not know as you wanted me to say anything with regard to another point, and that is this: I gather from what I have seen and from what I have heard while sitting here, of the religious education and the religious schools, you are especially referring to the religious education of members of liberal synagogues, and that these members or the children of these members, belong to what we may call well to do or fairly well to do classes; but I do not gather that this discussion touches the education of the very poor. My own work in London, so far as I have had to do with the question of religious education, related to some extent with the education of the very poor, largely of the Russian synagogues, which presents very special problems to us in London, and no doubt very special problems to you in America generally. Our conditions of course are very different from yours. We have in London, for instance, still a dual system of school education. We have schools which we call denominational schools or voluntary schools, and municipal schools. Although these schools are maintained partly by the rate tax, by the town, and partly by the State, and both are under strict inspection as regards secular instruction, as regards religious instruction, denominational schools have a very much larger measure of freedom; in return the denominations have to bear certain expenses in keeping up the school. There is a very large party, especially the great reformist party, who have the strongest objection to these so-called denominational schools, and it is quite possible they may before very long be entirely swept away, but at present as things are, in the denominational schools where there are I should think some eight or nine thousand Jewish children, time is still

allowed and allotted for the special Hebrew and religious education, but notwithstanding, even there, it has been found necessary to start extra classes after school hours. In the state schools or in the municipal schools, we have a double method of teaching religion. Religion, as you know, is not excluded from the municipal schools. In almost all municipal schools, a certain time is allowed for religious instruction, for there is a very strong conscience clause, and children need not go to listen, if they desire, the first hour in the morning. And in those schools where there is a large proportion of Jewish children, because, as you know, we have our special Ghetto quarter, as they have in New York, in those schools where there is 80 or 90 per cent. of Jewish children, a special curriculum has been drawn up by the State authorities for the religious instruction of the Jews. I was partly responsible, in connection with the Chief Rabbi, for drawing up this curriculum, and it is now largely used in these schools. The instruction for the first three quarters of an hour has to be of an undenominational character, according to the law of the Educational Act of '70, but it is confined to the reading of certain portions of Scripture, and, oddly, Hebrew is allowed to be taught as a language. That is supposed to be within the spirit and the letter of the Educational Act. But where the special code comes in is this: when these municipal schools were established, certain passages from the Bible were chosen to be learned by heart, and to be especially studied naturally suitable for Christian children and selected especially from the New Testament. We found that even those passages that came from the Old Testament, were not the most suitable for Jewish children to learn by heart, and so, with the assent of the municipal authorities, we have introduced the special curriculum by which the Jewish children learn other passages more suitable. We find that this works extremely well and that a certain foundation of religious education is thus given in the first three quarters of an hour in the morning to a very large number of children, larger even than in the synagogue schools. But in addition to that we find that it is necessary to give the children further religious instruction, and we have, under the auspices of the Religious Educational Board, to which I had the honor to belong for a short time. We have classes twice a week or sometimes

only once a week, on Sunday mornings, so that the children may get further religious instruction. These classes are either held on Sunday morning from ten to one, or they are held for two hours Sunday morning or one hour in week days. It is found better to hold them on Sunday morning. We find in addition to these classes which are held by the Jewish Religious Educational Board, a considerable number of the boys, not the girls, go to the Chedarim. Some go at the luncheon hour, others will go even before the school opens and others go in the evening.

An attempt has been made to organize these Chedarim and there are certain schools which can no longer be rightly regarded as such, which have been thoroughly organized, and where the teaching is conducted according to more or less modern methods in fairly thoroughly equipped buildings. But one thing I find necessary in the religious teaching of all this large number of children, it is to be, of course, conducted wholly and strictly on orthodox lines. The Jewish Religious Education Board, as regards instruction, is entirely in the hands of the Chief Rabbi, according to its constitution, and a very large proportion of the instruction is devoted to Hebrew. The consequence is the amount of ethical instruction and Biblical history is not very large. And when people protest, as they do to me in England, on Liberal Judaism, that it means often neglect of the study of Hebrew, . . . I am bound to reply to them, if it does mean sometimes neglect of Hebrew, it also means increased time and opportunity for ethical, religious and historical knowledge.

Isaac Mayer Wise

Founder of

Central Conference of American Rabbis

President 1889-1900

PRESIDENTS.

ISAAC M. WISE.....	1889-1900
JOSEPH SILVERMAN	1900-1903
JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF	1903-1905
JOSEPH STOLZ	1905-1907
DAVID PHILIPSON	1907-1909
MAX. HELLER	1909-

DECEASED MEMBERS.

SAMUEL ADLER, New York	1891
LIEBMAN ADLER, Chicago	1892
M. SOLOMON, Appleton, Wis.	1892
HEINRICH ZIRNDORF, Cincinnati ..	1893
HERMAN BIRKENTHAL, Hamilton, Ont.	1893
HENRY M. BIEN, Vicksburg, Miss.	1895
LEON STRAUSS, Belleville, Ill.	1895
AARON WISE, New York	1896
ISRAEL JOSEPH, Montgomery, Ala.	1897
DAVID FEUERLICHT, Owensboro, Ky.	1897
IGNATZ GROSSMANN, Chicago	1897
ISAAC M. WISE, Cincinnati	1900
I. STEMPEL, Yonkers, N. Y.	1900
ABRAHAM LAZARUS, Houston, Tex.	1900
OSCAR J. COHEN, Mobile, Ala.	1901
AARON LOEWENHEIM, Chicago	1901
ADOLPH MOSES, Louisville	1902
BENJAMIN SZOLD, Baltimore	1902
MOSES MIELZINER, Cincinnati	1903
GUSTAVE GOTTHEIL, New York	1903
E. K. FISCHER, Chattanooga	1903
LIPPMAN MAYER, Pittsburg	1904
AARON NORDEN, Chicago	1905
H. J. M. CHUMACEIRO, Curacao, Dutch West Indies.....	1905
ISAAC SCHWAB, St. Joseph, Mo.	1907

RAPHAEL BENJAMIN, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1907
EMANUEL L. HESS, St. Paul, Minn.	1907
JUDAH WECHSLER, Indianapolis, Ind.	1907
ALOIS KAISER, Baltimore, Md.	1908
BERNARD FELSENTHAL, Chicago, Ill.	1908
JACOB VOORSANGER, San Francisco, Cal.	1908
SOLOMON SONNENSCHIN, St. Louis, Mo.	1908
ADOLPH M. RADIN, New York City	1909
JOSEPH HERZ, Columbus, Miss.	1909
L. WEISS, Bradford, Pa.	1909
SIGMUND MANNHEIMER, Cincinnati	1909
BENJAMIN A. BONNHEIM, Cincinnati	1909
EPHRAIM FELDMAN, Cincinnati	1910

MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
RABBIS.*

HONORARY MEMBERS.

MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G., London, England.

WINTNER, LEOPOLD, Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Temple Beth Elohim, Brooklyn;
401 W. 117th St., New York City.

ACTIVE MEMBERS.

Aaron, Israel, B.A., D.D., Rabbi, Temple Beth Zion, 748 Auburn Ave.,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Abelson, Alter, Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 510 Madison Ave., Helena, Mont.

Alexander, David, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shomer Emoonim, 229 Win-
throp St., Toledo, O.

Anspacher, Abraham S., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 845 Mon-
roe Ave., Scranton, Pa.

Barnstein, Henry, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 702 Gray Ave.,
Houston, Tex.

Bauer, Solomon H., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth, 556 N. Hoyne Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

Bergman, Moise, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Gates of Prayer, 5914 Pitt St.,
New Orleans, La.

Berkowitz, Henry, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 1823 N.
33d St., Philadelphia.

Bernstein, Louis, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Adath Joseph, 1601 Francis St., St.
Joseph, Mo.

Blatt, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Temple B'nai Israel, 1305 Dale Ave., Oklahoma
City, Okla.

Blau, Joel, B.A., Rabbi, 1438 Forty-Fifth St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Blaustein, David, M.A., Superintendent Chicago Hebrew Institute, 1258
Taylor St., Chicago, Ill.

Bloch, Jacob, M.A., LL.D., Rabbi, 586 Couch St., Portland, Ore.

Blum, A., Rabbi, 138 W. 81st St., New York City.

Bogen, Joseph, LL.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 430 E. Baltimore
St., Jackson, Tenn.

Bottigheimer, Seymour G., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 211 S.
Commerce St., Natchez, Miss.

Braun, Frederick E., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurum, Lincoln,
Neb.

*If your name and address herein shown is not correct, please notify Rabbi
Ephraim Frisch, Corresponding Secretary, 1121 W. 2nd Ave., Pine Bluff, Ark.,
and Rabbi Moses J. Gries, Treasurer, 2045 E. 93rd St., Cleveland, Ohio.

- Brill, Abram, B.A., Rabbi, Hebrew Union Congregation, 607 Washington Ave., Greenville, Miss.
- Buttenweiser, Moses, Ph.D., Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3208 Fredonia Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Calisch, Edward N., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Ahabah, 2702 Monument Ave., Richmond, Va.
- Caro, Victor, Rabbi, Congregation B'ne Jeshurun, 237 Tenth St., Milwaukee, Wis.
- Cohen, Henry, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Tex.
- Cohen, Montague N. A., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, Box 596, Butte, Mont.
- Cohen, Simon R., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, 1387 Dean St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Cohn, Frederick, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Israel, 1302 Park Ave., Omaha, Neb.
- Cronbach, Abraham, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 508 Colfax Ave., South Bend, Ind.
- Currick, Max C., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 654 W. 8th St., Erie, Pa.
- Deinard, Samuel N., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Shaare Tov, 513 E. 32d St., Minneapolis, Minn.
- Deutsch, G., Ph.D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3600 Wilson Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Drucker, Aaron P., Rabbi, 1813 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Ehrenreich, Bernard C., Rabbi, Congregation Kahl Montgomery, 58 Sayre St., Montgomery, Ala.
- Elkin, Heiman J., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, Beaumont, Tex.
- Elkin, Meyer, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 86 Windsor Ave., Hartford, Conn.
- Ellinger, Emil, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1616 Front St., San Diego, Cal.
- Elzas, Barnett A., B.A., M.D., LL.D., Rabbi, Hebrew Congregation of the Deaf, 1919 Seventh Ave., New York City.
- Enelow, H. G., D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Adath Israel, 1670 Willow Ave., Louisville, Ky.
- Englander, Henry, M.A., Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.
- Ettelson, Harry W., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Achduth Vesholom, 350 W. Berry St., Ft. Wayne, Ind.
- Faber, M., Rabbi, Congregation Bethel, Tyler, Tex.
- Feuerlicht, Jacob, Rabbi, Superintendent, Home for Jewish Friendless, 53d St. and Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Feuerlicht, Morris M., B.A., Rabbi, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, 2837 Washington Blvd., Indianapolis, Ind.

- Fineshriber, William H., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 217 E. 14th St., Davenport, Ia.
- Fisher, Henry M., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 109 Seaside Ave., Atlantic City, N. J.
- Foster, Solomon, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 264 Clinton Ave., Newark, N. J.
- Fox, G. George, Ph.B., Rabbi, Beth-El Congregation, Ft. Worth, Tex.
- Frank, Julius, Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Shalom, 36 S. 9th St., Reading, Pa.
- Franklin, Leo. M., B.L., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El, 71 Brainard St., Detroit, Mich.
- Freund, Charles J., B.S., B.L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 524 E. 2nd South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Frey, Sigmund, Rabbi, Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum, 535 Mission Road, Los Angeles, Cal.
- Friedlander, Joseph, Rabbi, Hamilton, Ontario.
- Friedlander, M. Rabbi, First Hebrew Congregation, 29 E. Moss Ave., Oakland, Cal.
- Friedman, William S., B.L., LL.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, 1060 Emerson St., Denver, Colo.
- Frish, Ephraim, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth, 205 Martin Ave., Pine Bluff, Ark.
- Gerechter, Emanuel, Rabbi, Zion Congregation, 671 Washington St., Appleton, Wis.
- Goldenson, Samuel H., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Emeth, 551 Myrtle Ave., Albany, N. Y.
- Goldstein, Sidney, B.A., Rabbi, Superintendent of Social Service Work, Free Synagogue, 81st St., Columbus and Amsterdam Aves., New York City.
- Gordon, Nathan. M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Emanuel, 68 Stanley St., Montreal, Can.
- Grad, Bennett, B.A., Rabbi, Austin, Tex.
- Greenburg, William H., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Emmanuel, 743 S. Ervay St., Dallas, Tex.
- Gries, M. J., B.A., Rabbi, The Temple, 2045 E. 93d St., Cleveland, O.
- Gross, Louis Daniel, M.A., Rabbi, Akron Hebrew Congregation, 194 Beck Ave., Akron, O.
- Grossman, Rudolph, B.L., D.D., Rabbi, Temple Rodeph Shalom, 1347 Lexington Ave., New York City.
- Grossman, Louis. B.A., D.D., Professor, Hebrew Union College; Rabbi Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 2212 Park Ave., W. H., Cincinnati, O.
- Guttmacher, Adolf, Ph.D., Rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, 2239 Brookfield Ave., Baltimore, Md.
- Guttman, Adolph. Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Society of Concord, 102 Walnut Place, Syracuse, N. Y.

- Harris, Maurice H., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel of Harlem, 254 W. 103d St., New York City.
- Harrison, Leon, B.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 5083 Morgan St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Hausmann, Gustav N., Litt.D., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation, 76 W. 114th St., New York City.
- Hecht, S., D.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Brith, 817 Beacon St., Los Angeles, Cal.
- Heller, Maximillian, M.L., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Sinai, 1828 Marengo St., New Orleans, La.
- Hirschberg, Abram, B.A., Rabbi, North Chicago Hebrew Congregation, 177 Lakeview Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Hirschberg, Samuel, M.A., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 543 Murray Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
- Isaacs, A.S., Ph.D., New York University, Washington Sq., New York City.
- Jacobs, Pizer W., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Ahavath Chesed, 1627 Boulevard, Jacksonville, Fla.
- Jacobson, Jacob S., Ph.D., Rabbi, Zion Congregation of West Chicago, 1945 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
- Jacobson, Moses P., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Hebrew Zion, Shreveport, La.
- Jasin, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Ligonier, Ind.
- Jesselson, Felix W., M.A., Rabbi, 109 Ransom St., Danville, Pa.
- Joseph, Theodore F., B.A., Rabbi, Third St. Temple, Mansion House, Troy, N. Y.
- Kahn, Emanuel, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 57 Kellogg St., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Kaplan, Bernard M., Rabbi, Congregation Ohabei Shalome, 267 Eighth Ave., San Francisco, Cal.
- Kaplan, Jacob H., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Mishkan Israel, Hotel Albert, Selma, Ala.
- Klein, Israel, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Zion of West Chicago, 1804 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Klein, Jacob, Rabbi, Congregation Or Chodosh, 5934 Aberdeen St., Chicago, Ill.
- Koch, Samuel, M.A., Rabbi, Temple de Hirsch, 300 Occidental Ave., Seattle, Wash.
- Kohler, Kaufman, Ph.D., Rabbi, President, Hebrew Union College, 3016 Stanton Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Kohut, Geo. A., Ph.D., Rabbi, 781 West End Ave., New York City.
- Kornfeld, J. S., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Bene Israel, 366 Linwood Ave., Columbus, O.
- Kory, Sol. L., B.A., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation, 1112 E. Jackson St., Vicksburg, Miss.

- Krass, Nathan, B.A., LL.D., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, 690 E. Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Krauskopf, Joseph, D.D., Rabbi, Temple Keneseth Israel, 4715 Pulaski Ave. (Germantown), Philadelphia, Pa.
- Kuppin, Louis, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Sholem, Kahal Kadosh, 1624 York St., Quincy, Ill.
- Landau, Jacob Henry, Rabbi, Congregation Adath Jeshurun, 2320 Tioga St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Landman, Isaac, B.S., Rabbi, Temple Keneseth Israel, 229 Apsley St. (Germantown), Philadelphia, Pa.
- Landsberg, Max, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Berith Kodesh, 420 Main St., E., Rochester, N. Y.
- Lefkovits, Maurice, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, Box 726, Duluth, Minn.
- Lefkowitz, David, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 55 Richmond Ave., Dayton, O.
- Leipziger, Emil W., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, 626 Walnut St., Terre Haute, Ind.
- Leiser, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Keneseth Israel, 224 S. Madison St., Allentown, Pa.
- Leucht, Joseph, Rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 344 High St., Newark, N. J.
- Levi, Charles S., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshai Emeth, National Hotel, Peoria, Ill.
- Levi, Gerson B., M.A., Rabbi, B'nai Shalom Temple Israel, 3540 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Levi, Harry, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Leshem Shomayim, 45 S. Broadway, Wheeling, W. Va.
- Levy, Abraham R., Ph.B., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Abraham, 2131 Forty-Eighth St., Chicago, Ill.
- Levy, Edward S., Rabbi, United Hebrew Congregation, Ft. Smith, Ark.
- Levy, Felix A., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 864 Wellington St., Chicago, Ill.
- Levy, J. Leonard, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 1526 Dennistown Ave., E., Pittsburg, Pa.
- Levy, M. S., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1225 O'Farrell St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Lewinthal, Isidore, Rabbi, Congregation Ohavai Sholom, 2513 Thompson St., cor. 26th Ave., Nashville, Tenn.
- Liknaitz, David L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 6th and Osage Sts., Leavenworth, Kan.
- Loewenberg, William, Cantor, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Lovitch, Meyer, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 1408 Broadway, Paducah, Ky.

- Lowenstein, Solomon C., B.A., Rabbi, Superintendent Hebrew Orphan Asylum, 137th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York City.
- Lyons, Alexander, B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, 526 Eighth St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Machol, M., Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 7112 Hough Ave., Cleveland, O.
- Magnes, J. L., Ph.D., Rabbi, 17 Livingston Place, New York City.
- Mannheimer, Eugene, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Victoria Hotel, Des Moines, Ia.
- Mannheimer, Leo, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 282 Broadway, Patterson, N. J.
- Marcuson, Isaac E., B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, Charleston, S. C.
- Margolis, Elias, Rabbi, 550 W. 114th St., New York City.
- Marks, Samuel, Rabbi, Temple Beth El, 114 W. Quincy St., San Antonio, Tex.
- Marx, David, B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Gemilath Chesed, 354 Washington St., Atlanta, Ga.
- Mayer, Eli, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 2247 N. 17th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Mayer, Harry H., B.A., Rabbi, B'nai Jehudah Congregation, 2600 E. 28th St., Kansas City, Mo.
- Mendes, F. de Sola, Ph.D., Rabbi, West End Synagogue, 154 W. 82nd St., New York City.
- Mendoza, Louis D., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Ohev Sholom, 3 Raleigh Sq., Norfolk, Va.
- Merritt, Max J., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'ne Israel, 417 First St., Evansville, Ind.
- Messing, Abraham J., Jr., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'rith Sholom, Springfield, Ill., 602 N. Main St., Bloomington, Ill.
- Messing, Aaron J., Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'nai Sholom Temple Israel, 4848 Prairie Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Messing, Henry J., Rabbi emeritus, United Hebrew Congregation, 5249-a Morgan St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Messing, Mayer, Rabbi emeritus, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, 523 N. Delaware St., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Meyer, Julius H., B.A., Rabbi, 933 Exchange Bldg., 108 LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
- Meyer, Martin A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 2109 Baker St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Mielziner, Jacob, M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Sheerith Israel-Ahabath Achim, 519 Prospect Place, Cincinnati, O.
- Miller, Julian H., B.A., Rabbi, Mizpah Congregation, 626 McCallie Ave., Chattanooga, Tenn.

- Morgenstern, Julian, Ph.D., Rabbi, Instructor, Hebrew Union College, 3450 Highland Place, Cincinnati, O.
- Moses, Alfred G., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim, Government and Warren Sts., Mobile, Ala.
- Moses, Isaac S., Rabbi, Ahavath Chesed Shaar Hashomayim Congregation, 222 E. 61st St., New York City.
- Neumark, David, Ph.D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, "The Columbia," Winslow Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Newfield, Morris, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, 2150 S. 16th St., Birmingham, Ala.
- Newman, Julius, Rabbi, Moses Montefiore Congregation, 1112 N. Hoyne Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Nieto, Jacob, Rabbi, Congregation Sherith Israel, 3933 Clay St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Noot, M., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 416 W. Hemlock St., Hazelton, Pa.
- Peiser, Simon, B.A., Rabbi, Assistant Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, O.
- Philipson, David, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Bene Israel, 3947 Beechwood Ave., Rose Hill, Cincinnati, O.
- Philo, Isadore C., Rabbi, 105 S. Balseh St., Akron, O.
- Raisin, Jacob S., B.A., Rabbi, Montefiore Congregation, 821 Eleventh St., E. Las Vegas, N. Mex.
- Raisin, Max, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1725 Twenty-Fourth Ave., Meridian, Miss.
- Rappaport, Julius, Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 2128 Crystal St., Chicago, Ill.
- Rauch, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Mt. Sinai Congregation, Box 287, Sioux City, Ia.
- Reichler, Max, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarei Shamayim, 337 Summit Ave., Schenectady, N. Y.
- Rhine, Abraham, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation House of Israel, 315 West Grand Ave., Hot Springs, Ark.
- Rosenau, William, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Shalom, 1515 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md.
- Rosenbaum, David, Ph.B., Rabbi, Congregation Israel, 50 Division St., Amsterdam, N. Y.
- Rosenthal, Frank L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1225 Second Ave., Columbus, Ga.
- Rosenthal, Isadore, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim, Lancaster, Pa.
- Rosenwasser, Herman, A.M., Rabbi, Temple Sinai, Lake Charles, La.
- Rothstein, Leonard J., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Gemiluth Hassodim, Box 92, Alexandria, La.

- Rubenstein, C. A., B.S., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Har Sinai, 2313 Callow Ave., Baltimore, Md.
- Rypins, Isaac L., B.L., Rabbi, Mount Zion Hebrew Congregation, 896 Lincoln Ave., St. Paul, Minn.
- Sadler, Bernard, Rabbi, Congregation Covenant of Peace, 909 Jackson St., Easton, Pa.
- Salzman, Marcus, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai B'rith, 94 W. Ross St., Wilkes Barre, Pa.
- Samfield, Max, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel, 218 Adams St., Memphis, Tenn.
- Schanfarber, Tobias, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Mayriv, 4017 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Schlesinger, Max, Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation Beth Emeth, 334 Hudson Ave., Albany, N. Y.
- Schreiber, Emanuel, Ph.D., Rabbi, Hebrew Reform Congregation, York, Pa.
- Schulman, Samuel, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 65 E. 92d St., New York City.
- Schwarz, Jacob D., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 11 N. Spring St., Pensacola, Fla.
- Schwarz, Samuel, T.S., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Apollo Apartments, E. 59th St., Cleveland, O.
- Sessler, M., Rabbi, 1111 Henry St., Roanoke, Va.
- Silber, Mendel, B.A., Rabbi, United Hebrew Congregation, 4813 Delmar Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
- Silverman, Joseph, D.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 45 E. 75th St., New York City.
- Simon, Abram, Ph.D., Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation, 2802 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.
- Singer, Jacob, M.A., Rabbi, Hebrew Reform Congregation Beth Israel, 146 E. Market St., York, Pa.
- Solomon, George, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Mickve Israel, 1516 Drayton St., Savannah, Ga.
- Solomon, Michael G., Rabbi, 208 Broadway, Pueblo, Colo.
- Spitz, M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai El, 3539 Flora Court, St. Louis, Mo.
- Stern, Louis, Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation, 1325 10th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Stern, Nathan, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Sons of Israel and David, 295 Potter Ave., Providence, R. I.
- Stolz, Joseph, D.D., Rabbi, Isaiah Temple, 4827 Langley Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Stolz, Joseph Henry, Ph.B., Rabbi, Lafayette, Ind.
- Ungerleider, M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Abraham, 4335 Calumet Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Volmer, Leon, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 1598 Lee St., Charleston, W. Va.

- Warsaw, Isidore, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Rodef Shalom, Waco, Tex.
- Weinstein, Aaron L., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth El, 626 Poplar St., Helena, Ark.
- Weiss, Harry, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 454 New St., Macon, Ga.
- Willner, Wolff, B.A., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Adath Jeshurun, 1109 Hamilton St., Houston, Tex.
- Wise, Jonah B., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 700 Davis St., Portland, Ore.
- Witt, Louis, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1022 W. 6th St., Little Rock, Ark.
- Wolf, Horace J., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Berith Kodesh, Rochester, N. Y.
- Wolfenstein, Samuel, Ph.D., Rabbi, Superintendent, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, O.
- Wolsey, Louis, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 1932 E. 116th St., Cleveland, O.
- Yudelson, Albert B., M.D., Rabbi, South Side Hebrew Congregation, 4539 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Zepin, George, B.A., Rabbi, Director, Department of Synagogue and School Extension, U. A. H. C., 90 Carew Bldg., 5th & Vine Sts., Cincinnati, O.
- Zielonka, Martin, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Mt. Sinai, Box 756, El Paso, Tex.

PUBLICATIONS.

- Union Prayer Book, Volumes I and II.
 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.
 Week Day Service.
 Service for House of Mourning.
 Evening Service for Week Day and Sabbath (For Field Secretary's Use).
 Union Hymnal.
 *Year Books, Volumes I to XIX.
 *Index of Year Books.
 The Union Haggadah for Passover Eve.
 *Set of Holiday, Sermons.
 Sermons by American Rabbis.
 *Views on the Synod.

REPRINTS.

- *Aspects of Theology of Reformed Judaism, by Prof. Max L. Margolis.
 *Rashi, by Prof. M. Schloessinger.
 *The Sabbath Commission, by Dr. J. Voorsanger.
 *Assyriology in the Bible, by Dr. K. Kohler.
 *Report of Committee on Relation between Rabbi and Congregation, by Dr. D. Philipson.
 *Funeral Agenda, by Dr. Joseph Stolz.
 *Gabriel Riesser, by Prof. G. Deutsch.
 *Samuel Holdheim, by Dr. David Philipson.
 *A Plan for Co-operative Work in Collecting Material for Encyclopedic Studies in Jewish History and Literature and Supplementary Explanations, by Prof. G. Deutsch..
 *Reform Movement as Reflected in Neo-Hebraic Literature, by Rabbi Max Raisin.
 *Why the Bible Should not be Read in the Public Schools, by Committee on Church and State.

- *The Origin and Function of Ceremonies in Judaism, by Dr. K. Kohler.
- *Moses Hayyim Luzzatto, by Rabbi Isaac Landman.
- *Samson Raphael Hirsch, by Rabbi Max. Heller.
- *The Significance of the Bible for Reform Judaism in the Light of Modern Scientific Research, by Dr. Julian Morgenstern.
- *Crescas and Spinoza, by Prof. David Neumark.

TRACTS.

- *I. What Do Jews Believe? by Dr. H. G. Enelow.
- *II. The Jew in America, by Dr. David Philipson.
(Those publications marked (*) may be obtained free of charge upon application to the Corresponding Secretary.)

TRAVELING LIBRARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.
(Applications for the use of this Library should be addressed to the Chairman, Rabbi Wm. S. Friedman, LL.D.)

1. Bible in the Public Schools, The—Account of the Minor Case against the Cincinnati Board of Education.
2. Moral Education, by Edw. Howard Griggs.
3. Moral Instruction of Children, The, by Felix Adler.
4. Religious Freedom in American Education, by Jos. Henry Crooke.
5. Religious Liberty in the United States, by Oscar S. Straus.
6. Roger Williams, the Pioneer of Religious Liberty, by Oscar S. Straus.
7. Reply to Justice Brewer, by Isaac Hassler.

THE BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY, 40 E. Fourteenth Street,
New York City, has exclusive charge of the sale of the Publi-
cations of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

VOLUME XXI

EPHRAIM FRISCH, JULIAN MORGENSTERN,
MAX. HELLER AND DAVID MARX

1911



5671

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION

ST. PAUL AND MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

JUNE 30 TO JULY 6, 1911.

Report of Committee on Bible Fund	106
Report of Committee on Prayer Book Revision	106
Report of Auditing Committee	107
Report of Special Committee on Recommendations Contained in Rabbi Schanfarber's Paper	108
Discussion of Question of Ethical Instruction in the Public Schools	108-113
Report of Committee on President's Message	113-118
Report of Committee on Resolutions	118
Report of Committee on Thanks	118
Invitations to Next Conference	119
Report of Committee on Nominations	120
Election of Officers	120-122
Adjournment	122
Amendments to Constitution Proposed	123
Summary	124-127
In Memoriam Professor Ephraim Feldman	128

APPENDIX.

A. Message of President, Rabbi Max. Heller	129-141
B. Conferencé Sermon, Rabbi Moses J. Gries	142-148
C-1. "Ludwig Philippson," Rabbi Joseph S. Kornfeld	149-190
C-2. Discussion, Rabbi Mendel Silber	191-192
D-1. "The Basis of Membership in the American Synagogue," Rabbi Louis Witt	193-207
D-2. Discussion, Rabbi Leo M. Franklin	208-212
E. "Leopold Loew," Rabbi Julius Rappaport	213-229
F. "The Harvest Service," Rabbi David Philipson	230-234
G. "Correspondence School for Jewish Teachers," Rabbi Henry Berkowitz	235-240
H-1. "The Problem of Ethical Instruction in the Public Schools," Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber	241-257
H-2. Discussion, Rabbi Martin Zielonka	258-262
I. "Sabbath-School Work for High School Pupils"	263-270
J. "Some Aspects of Jewish Apologetics," Rabbi Max. C. Currick	271-305
K. "Leopold Stein," Rabbi Harry W. Ettelson	306-327
Memorial Page to Rabbi Isaac M. Wise	328
Past Presidents	329
Deceased Members	329-330
Officers, 1911-1912	331
Standing Committees, 1911-1912	332-334
Temporary Committees	335
Year and Place of Previous Meetings	336
List and Addresses of Members, 1911-1912	337-345
Publications	346
Books in Traveling Library of Committee on Church and State	347

OFFICERS

FOR THE YEAR 1910-1911.

HONORARY PRESIDENT,

KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, O.

PRESIDENT,

MAX. HELLER, New Orleans, La.

VICE-PRESIDENT,

SAMUEL SCHULMAN, New York City.

TREASURER,

MOSES J. GRIES, Cleveland, O.

RECORDING SECRETARY,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Cincinnati, O.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY,

EPHRAIM FRISCH, Pine Bluff, Ark.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

I. AARON	Buffalo, N. Y.
W. FINESHRIBER	Davenport, Ia.
L. M. FRANKLIN	Detroit, Mich.
M. H. HARRIS	New York, N. Y.
D. LEFKOWITZ	Dayton, O.
D. MARX	Atlanta, Ga.
D. PHILIPSON	Cincinnati, O.
I. L. RYPINS	St. Paul, Minn.
J. STOLZ	Chicago, Ill.
L. WITT	Little Rock, Ark.

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1910-1911.

Publication.

A. Guttmacher,	S. Foster,	S. H. Goldenson.
M. H. Harris,		J. Silverman.

Relief Fund.

J. Stolz,	C. S. Levi,	I. L. Rypins,
-----------	-------------	---------------

Sermonic Literature.

S. Hirschberg,	J. H. Kaplan,	A. Brill,
H. Levi,	J. Friedlander,	J. Nieto,
	W. Willner.	

Ministers' Handbook.

M. H. Harris,	H. G. Enelow,	M. M. Feuerlicht,
L. J. Rothstein,		M. Samfield.

Contemporaneous History.

G. Deutsch,	M. N. A. Cohen,	I. Lewinthal.
-------------	-----------------	---------------

Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology.

S. Schulman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. Landsberg,
A. Cronbach,	M. Friedlander,	K. Kohler,
M. Lefkowitz,	D. Neumark,	M. Raisin,
	W. Rosenau.	

Social and Religious Union.

H. Weiss,	E. W. Leipziger,	A. Rhine,
	J. Rappaport.	

Lyceum Bureau.

L. M. Franklin,	S. L. Kory,	S. G. Bottigheimer,
I. Aaron,		E. Mannheimer.

Church and State.

W. S. Friedman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. A. Meyer,
A. Simon,	N. Gordon,	D. Lefkowitz,
M. Newfield,		J. B. Wise.

Religious Work in Universities.

E. N. Calisch,	H. Englander,	G. Fox,
F. Cohn,	B. Elzas,	A. Hirschberg,
S. Koch,		I. Warsaw.

Personal Prayers.

H. Berkowitz,	H. Fisher,	I. Landman,
E. Mayer,	C. A. Rubenstein,	M. Salzman.

Religious Education.

M. J. Gries,	H. G. Enelow,	M. H. Harris,
J. S. Kornfeld,	J. S. Raisin,	J. L. Levy,
H. Berkowitz,	W. H. Fineshriber,	L. Grossman,
N. Krass,	J. Krauskopf,	J. H. Landau,
A. Simon,	G. Solomon,	J. Stolz.

Curators of Archives.

J. Morgenstern,	J. Mielziner.
-----------------	---------------

Investments.

I. E. Marcuson,	M. J. Gries,	J. H. Meyer.
-----------------	--------------	--------------

Responsa.

G. Deutsch,	K. Kohler.
-------------	------------

Defectives, Dependents, Delinquents.

J. S. Kornfeld,	D. Blaustein,	S. C. Lowenstein,
S. Peiser,		A. Simon.

Civil and Religious Marriage Laws.

E. Frisch,	J. Blau,	S. Deinard,
H. Barnstein,	M. Reichler,	A. Weinstein,
	M. Lovitch.	

Editing Year Book.

D. Marx,	J. Morgenstern,	M. Heller.
----------	-----------------	------------

Synagogal Music.

H. H. Mayer,	B. C. Ehrenreich,	M. Lovitch,
M. H. Harris,	H. Ettelson,	D. Marx,
F. de Sola Mendes,	J. Singer,	N. Stern.

Tracts.

M. Heller,	L. M. Franklin,	D. Philipson,
J. Stolz,		L. Wolsey.

Finance.

E. Frisch,	D. Marx,	J. Morgenstern.
------------	----------	-----------------

Summer Services.

G. Zepin,	W. H. Fineshriber,	S. R. Cohen,
C. J. Freund,	T. Schanfarber,	S. Hecht.

Pulpit Bureau.

H. Cohen,	M. Bergman,	E. N. Calisch,
H. Englander,	M. Friedlander,	W. S. Friedman,
M. H. Harris,	J. Rauch,	G. Zepin.

Conversion Formula.

D. Philipson,	H. G. Enelow,	L. M. Franklin,
K. Kohler,		D. Neumark.

Revision of Prayer Book.

J. Stolz,	I. S. Moses,	M. H. Harris.
M. Heller,	A. Guttmacher,	K. Kohler.
T. Schanfarber,		J. Silverman.

Board of Arbitration.

J. Stolz,	G. B. Levi,	T. Schanfarber.
-----------	-------------	-----------------

Soliciting Funds.

J. Morgenstern,	M. J. Gries,	A. Guttmacher,
M. Heller,	E. Frisch,	D. Philipson,
	J. Stolz.	

Bible Fund.

D. Philipson,	L. Harrison,	S. Hecht,
W. H. Greenburg,	A. G. Moses,	M. Zielonka.

Week-Day Service.

H. G. Enelow,	Leo M. Franklin,	M. J. Gries.
---------------	------------------	--------------

Synagog and Labor.

S. Foster,	D. Blaustein,	S. N. Deinard,
A. Cronbach,	E. Mayer,	L. Mannheimer.

. Text-Book Commission.

M. J. Gries,	D. Philipson,	A. Simon,
F. de Sola Mendes,	L. M. Franklin,	L. Grossman,
E. N. Calisch,	G. Zepin,	M. Harris,
J. S. Kornfeld,	J. Stolz,	W. H. Fineshriber,
H. Berkowitz,	H. G. Enelow,	J. Krauskopf,
N. Krass,	J. S. Raisin,	G. Solomon,
J. L. Levy,		J. H. Landau.

Co-operation in Cases of Emergency.

M. Heller,	S. Schulman,	M. J. Gries,
J. Krauskopf,		D. Philipson.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS*

ARTICLE I.—NAME.

This organization shall be known as the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECT.

The object of this organization shall be, to foster a feeling of association and brotherhood among the Rabbis and other Jewish scholars of America, to advance the cause of Jewish learning, to encourage all efforts toward the propagation of the teachings of Judaism, and to make provision for such worthy colleagues, as owing to advanced age or other cause, are prevented from following their calling.

ARTICLE III.—MEMBERSHIP.

SECTION 1. Professors of rabbinical seminaries, active and retired rabbis who are graduates of a rabbinical seminary, and ministers, not graduates of a rabbinical seminary, who have been for five years in the ministry and three consecutive years been performing the functions of a rabbi in one and the same congregation shall be eligible to membership. All applications for membership shall be acted upon by the Executive Board.*¹

SEC. 2. Honorary members may be elected by the Conference when unanimously proposed by the Executive Board.

ARTICLE IV.—DUES.

SECTION 1. The annual dues of members shall be five dollars, payable at the beginning of each fiscal year.

SEC. 2. These dues shall entitle the members to a copy of all publications of the Association.

*Adopted at Milwaukee, v. Year Book 1896, p. 71.

*¹ Year Book XIX p. 145. XX. p. 111, 151.

SEC. 3. One-half of the annual dues collected shall be paid into a fund called "The Relief Fund of the Conference," to be used at the discretion of the Trustees of this Fund for the assistance of any deserving or properly qualified Rabbi who has been in service in America at least five years, or his family.*²

SEC. 4. Any member in arrears for two years' dues, shall be suspended by the Executive Board, and may be reinstated at any future time by the Executive Board upon payment of all arrears. Notification of suspension shall be sent to the suspended member by the Corresponding Secretary.

SEC. 5. In exceptional cases, where it may be deemed proper, the Executive Board may remit some or all the dues of a member.

ARTICLE V.—EXPULSION.

SECTION 1. When any member of this Conference, by public or private conduct, has rendered himself unworthy of membership, the Executive Board shall make thorough investigation of the charges, giving the accused ample opportunity to defend himself, and if the charges are found true, shall expel said member from the Conference.

SEC. 2. No expulsion shall be made unless eight (8) or more members of the Executive Board vote for the same.

SEC. 3. An expelled member shall have the right to appeal from the decision of the Executive Board to the Conference at its regular annual meeting, and the session at which such appeal is heard shall be executive.

ARTICLE VI.—OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. The officers of this Conference shall be a President a Vice-President, Recording Secretary, corresponding Secretary, and Treasurer, who, with the addition of eleven*¹ executive members shall constitute the Executive Board.

SEC. 2. There shall be three Trustees who shall have charge of the moneys in the "Relief Fund of the Conference," and of the distribution of the same.

SEC. 3. These officers shall be elected annually by ballot, and shall hold their offices until their successors have been elected, pro-

*² Milwaukee Year Book, p. 76.

*¹ Year Book XIV, p. 163, XVI p. 69 and XVII p. 79.

vided, however, that no member shall be eligible to the presidency for more than two successive terms.*²

ARTICLE VII.—MEETINGS.

SECTION 1. This Association shall meet annually in general Conference in the month of July, at such time and place as the previous Conference or its Executive Board shall decide.

SEC. 2. Notice of the time and place of each annual meeting shall be mailed to all members, at least four weeks in advance.

ARTICLE VIII.—AMENDMENTS.

SECTION 1. Amendments to this Constitution shall be submitted in writing to be presented before the Convention in one year and acted upon at the next Annual Convention.

SEC. 2. The Executive Board shall give notice of proposed amendments to each member at least four weeks before the annual meeting.

SEC. 3. A two-thirds vote of the members present at an annual meeting shall be necessary to adopt any such proposed amendment.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I.—DUTIES OF OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE BOARD.

SECTION 1. The officers of the Conference shall perform the duties usually incumbent upon such officers. They shall submit annually to the Conference a report in writing, of their official transactions in the past year.

SEC. 2. The Treasurer and Trustees of the Relief Fund shall give bonds in such sums as shall be determined by the Executive Board. No moneys of the Conference shall be paid out by the Treasurer except per vouchers drawn by the Corresponding Secretary and signed by the President.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Executive Board:

a. To take charge of the affairs of the Conference during adjournment.

*²v. Year Book XII, p. 97 and XIII p. 101.

b. To arrange a specified program for the work of each meeting and to send same to each member of the Conference at least four weeks in advance of the annual meeting.

c. To publish in pamphlet form, and in time for distribution at the annual meeting, a Year Book, containing a full report of the transactions of the preceding convention together with papers read and addresses made or abstracts of the same.

SEC. 4. Notice of meetings of the Executive Board and of the business to be brought up at such meetings, shall be sent to all members of the Board at least two weeks before the meetings take place, and every member of the Board shall have the right to express his opinion and record his vote by correspondence. No important matter shall be decided in the Executive Board except by majority vote of all its members, expressed either in person or in writing. Five members of the Executive Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 5. Vacancies occurring in the Board after adjournment of the Conference shall be filled by the Board for the unexpired term until the next election.

ARTICLE II.—TEMPORARY COMMITTEES.

SECTION 1.*¹ The President shall at the opening of each convention of the Conference appoint the following temporary committees:

1. Committee on President's Message.
2. Committee on Resolutions.
3. Committee on Nominations.
4. Auditing Committee.

SEC. 3. The Committee on President's Message shall take charge of the same and shall report on any suggestions or recommendation contained therein.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Resolutions shall take charge of all resolutions offered at the convention, unless otherwise ordered, and report upon the same before final adjournment.

SEC. 4.*² The Committee on Nominations shall submit a list of names to be voted on at the concluding session of each conven-

*¹ Year Book XVI, p. 71, Year Book XVII p. 63, Year Book XVIII, 130.

*² Year Book XVI, p. 71, Year Book XVII, p. 64.

tion for all officers specified in Article VI., Section 1, of the Constitution.

SEC. 5. The Auditing Committee shall examine the Treasurer's report and the financial report of all committees handling moneys of and by authority of the Conference, and shall report thereon.

ARTICLE III.—STANDING COMMITTEES.

SECTION 1.*¹ The President shall appoint the following committees and such other standing committees as may be found necessary by the Conference from time to time:

1. Committee on Publication.
2. Committee on Finance.
3. Committee on Investment.
4. Committee on Relations of Church and State.
5. Committee on Contemporaneous History.
6. Curators of Archives.
7. Committee on Religious Schools.
8. Trustees of Ministers' Fund.
9. Committee on Card Index.
10. Committee on Social and Religious Union.
11. Committee on Tracts.
12. Committee on Lyceum Bureau.

SEC. 2.*² The Committee on Publication shall have charge of all publications of the Conference authorized by the Executive Board, excepting the Year Book. It shall make a report to the Executive Board whenever requested to do so.

SEC. 3.*³ The Committee on Finance shall consist of the Corresponding Secretary of the Conference as Chairman and two members of the Executive Committee. To it shall be referred all recommendations of appropriation of money, upon which it shall report to the Conference if in session, otherwise to the Executive Committee. It shall submit to the Conference at its annual convention a complete report of the finances of the Conference. It shall submit to the Executive Committee at its fall meeting a financial report and a budget for the year.

*¹ Year Book XVI, p. 71. Year Book XVII, p. 63, XVIII 130.

*² Year Book XX, p. 147.

*³ Year Book XVIII, p. 129.

SEC. 4.*¹ The Committee on Investments, of which the Treasurer shall be a member, shall invest all funds of the Conference, subject to the instructions of the Executive Committee. It shall present to the Conference at its annual convention a complete report of investments, duly audited.

SEC. 5.*² The Committee on Relations of Church and State shall report on encroachments upon the rights of conscience in our country and shall collect literary material helpful toward the protection and preservation of those rights.

SEC. 6.*³ The Committee on Contemporaneous History shall report to each convention of the Conference on all important matters of Jewish interest which have occurred during the year.

SEC. 7.*⁴ The Curators of the Archives shall, for permanent safe keeping in the appointed place of deposit, take charge of all papers, books and documents of the Conference, to be preserved, and shall prepare for ready reference an index record of the same.

SEC. 8.*⁵ The Committee on Religious Schools shall consider and report on questions submitted to the Conference relating to religious education.

SEC. 9.*⁶ The Committee on Card Index shall gather all data of historic interest from current periodicals and newly published books and record them under proper captions on alphabetically arranged cards which shall be preserved in a place designated by this Conference. This committee shall gradually extend its work to the historical data contained in old periodicals and works of history.

SEC. 10. The Committee on Social and Religious Union shall gather and collate statistics relating to congregational activities outside the pulpit and religious school, devise and recommend ways and means of emphasizing the central character of the congregation in the scheme of Jewish life and suggest measures that shall make for the greater efficiency of the Synagogue.

*¹ Year Book XVI, p. 71; XVII, p. 64, XVIII p. 130.

*² Year Book XVI, p. 71; XVII, 64.

*³ Year Book XVI, p. 71; XVII, p. 64.

*⁴ Year Book XVI, p. 72; XVII, p. 64.

*⁵ Year Book XVI, p. 72; XVII, p. 64.

*⁶ Year Book XVII, p. 64.

ARTICLE IV.—QUORUM.

Twenty-one members shall constitute a quorum at the meetings of the Conference for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE V.—ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR ANNUAL MEETINGS.

1. Roll Call.
2. Secretary's Report of the transactions of the Executive Board, including the full proceedings of its last meeting.
3. Program of business for the daily sessions.
4. Appointment of Standing Committees.
5. Report of President.
6. Reports of other officers.
7. Offering of Resolutions.
8. Reports of Standing Committees.
9. Reports of Special Committees.
10. Reading of Papers.
11. Unfinished Business.
12. New Business.
13. Election of Officers.
14. Sketch of the Minutes of the Conference.

ARTICLE VI.—AMENDMENTS.

These By-Laws may be amended or altered by a two-thirds vote of the members present at any meeting of the Conference.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

PROGRAM OF

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

ST. PAUL, MINN., JUNE 30—JULY 6, 1911

FRIDAY EVENING, JUNE 30.

Opening Prayer	Rabbi W. S. Friedman
Sabbath Service	Rabbi L. J. Rothstein
Address of Welcome	Rabbi I. L. Rypins
Response and Conference Lecture	Rabbi S. Schulman
Benediction	Rabbi I. Aaron

SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 1.

Opening Prayer	Rabbi F. Cohn
Sabbath Service	Rabbi M. Merritt
Conference Sermon	Rabbi M. J. Gries
Benediction	Rabbi J. Feuerlicht

SUNDAY MORNING, JULY 2.

Prayer	Rabbi D. Marx
Roll Call.	
Message of the President	Rabbi Max. Heller
Reports:	
Corresponding Secretary	Rabbi E. Frisch
Recording Secretary	Rabbi J. Morgenstern
Treasurer	Rabbi M. J. Gries
Solicitation Committee	Rabbi J. Morgenstern
Paper: "Ludwig Philippson, in honor of the Centenary of His Birth,"	Rabbi J. S. Kornfeld
Discussion	Rabbi M. Silber

SUNDAY AFTERNOON.

Reports:

Publication Committee	Rabbi A. Guttmacher
Finance	Rabbi E. Frisch
Investments	Rabbi I. E. Marcuson
Pulpit Bureau	Rabbi H. Cohen
Social and Religious Union	Rabbi H. Weiss
Conversion Certificate	Rabbi D. Philipson

Paper: "The Basis of Membership in the American

Synagogue"	Rabbi Louis Witt
Discussion	Rabbi L. M. Franklin

SUNDAY EVENING.

Round Table:

"The Synagog and Social Service"

Rabbi S. H. Goldenson, Leader.

MONDAY MORNING, JULY 3.

Prayer

Rabbi J. Singer

Reports:

Arbitration Committee	Rabbi J. Stolz
Contemporaneous History	Rabbi G. Deutsch

Memorial Service in Memory of Professor Euhraim Feldman.

Paper:

"Leopold Loew, in Honor of the Centenary of His Birth"

Rabbi Julius Rappaport

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

Reports:

Responsa	Rabbi G. Deutsch
Synagogal Music	Rabbi H. H. Mayer
Lyceum Bureau	Rabbi L. M. Franklin
Systematic Theology	Rabbi S. Schulman

TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 4.

Prayer	Rabbi D. Lefkowitz
National Anthem.	

Report of Committee on Church and State, Rabbi W. S. Friedman

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION DAY PROGRAM.

Report of Committee on Religious Education... Rabbi M. J. Gries
Paper: "The Harvest Service"..... Rabbi D. Philipson

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION DAY PROGRAM (CONTINUED).

Address: "Correspondence School for Jewish Teachers"

Rabbi H. Berkowitz

Paper: "The Problem of Ethical Instruction in Public
Schools" Rabbi T. Schanfarber

Discussion Rabbi M. Zielonka

Report Concerning Religious Education Exhibit, Rabbi M. J. Gries

Paper: "Sabbath-school Work for High School Pupils"

Rabbi L. M. Franklin

Report of Text-Book Commission Rabbi M. J. Gries

Round Table: "Interesting Features of the Year's Work."

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JULY 5.

Prayer Rabbi G. Fox

Reports:

Sermonic Literature Rabbi S. Hirschberg

Minister's Handbook Rabbi M. H. Harris

Tracts Rabbi M. Heller

Personal Prayers Rabbi H. Berkowitz

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

(Session in Temple, Minneapolis).

Paper: "Some Aspects of Jewish Apologetics"

Rabbi M. C. Currick

Reports:

Dependents, Defectives and Delinquents	Rabbi J. S. Kornfeld
Civil and Religious Marriage Laws	Rabbi E. Frisch
Summer Services	Rabbi G. Zepin
Week-Day Service	Rabbi H. G. Enelow
Synagog and Labor	Rabbi S. Foster

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

(Session at Commercial Club, Minneapolis).

Paper: "Leopold Stein, in Honor of the Centenary of His Birth"	Rabbi H. W. Ettelson
Round Tables on "Helpful Books of the Year."	
Drews' "The Christ Myth"	Rabbi S. N. Deinard, <i>Leader</i>
Jane Addams' "Twenty Years at Hull House"	
	Rabbi E. Mannheimer, <i>Leader</i>
Eschelbacher's "Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums"	Rabbi J. Rauch, <i>Leader</i>

THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 6.

Prayer	Rabbi H. Rosenwasser
--------	----------------------

Reports:

Co-operation in Emergency	Rabbi M. Heller
Memorial Resolutions	Rabbi G. Deutsch
Bible Fund	Rabbi D. Philipson
Prayer Book Revision	Rabbi J. Stolz
Auditing Committee	Rabbi G. Zepin
Special Committee on Resolutions Contained in Rabbi Schanfarber's Paper	Rabbi S. Schulman
President's Message	Rabbi J. Stolz
Resolutions	Rabbi H. Berkowitz
Thanks	Rabbi I. Aaron
Nominations	Rabbi D. Marx
Election of Officers.	
Closing Prayer and Benediction	Rabbi G. Deutsch
Adjournment.	

Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Convention OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

Held at St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., June 30 to July 6, 1911

The Twenty-Second Annual Convention of the Conference was opened Friday, June 30, 1911, at 8:00 p. m., with divine services at the Temple of Mt. Zion Hebrew Congregation. The invocation was spoken by Rabbi Wm. S. Friedman. The Sabbath eve service was read by Rabbi Leonard J. Rothstein. Rabbi I. L. Rypins, of Mt. Zion Hebrew Congregation of St. Paul, delivered the following address of welcome:

"Blessed are they who come in the name of God, we bless you from the house of God."

BRETHREN, MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS. "From far and near you have come to this our Sainly City; and we bid you a most hearty welcome. Our heart and our homes are open to receive you. We rejoice to have you assemble in Temple Mt. Zion. Your presence and your deliberation will accentuate anew the Prophet's word: "For out of Zion shall go forth the Law."

Brethren and Colleagues, your assemblage in our midst will serve to strengthen our loyalty for and our enthusiasm in Israel's Mission; and your counsel and wisdom will bring home to us the lofty purpose and high ideal of the American Rabbinate.

The modern Jew needs soul illumination on Israel's message of life's spiritual meeting; and we know that you, disciples and teachers of old, yet ever new Judaism will bring to us this quickening and enheartening inspiration. Therefore thrice welcome to you.

ויהי נעם יהוה אלהינו עלינו May the beauty of our God—the beauty of Harmony and the beauty of Holiness rest upon you; and may He bless the work you intend.

And as your coming gladdens and inspires us, so may your going endow us with a better knowledge and a larger hope in the great and good cause which has brought us together.

The response to this welcome and the Conference Lecture were delivered by the vice-president, Rabbi Samuel Schulman.

The benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Israel Aaron.

Divine services on Saturday morning, July 1st, were likewise held in the Temple. The opening prayer was delivered by Rabbi Frederick Cohn. The service for Sabbath morning was read by Rabbi Max. J. Merritt. The Conference Sermon was preached by Rabbi Moses J. Gries (cf. Appendix B.) The benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Jacob Feuerlicht.

SUNDAY MORNING, JULY 2, 1911.

The Conference was called to order at 10:00 a. m. by President Heller.

Rabbi David Marx opened the session with prayer.

During the convention the following forty-six members responded to the roll call:

Aaron, Israel, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Alexander, David, Toledo, O.
 Berkowitz, Henry, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Cohn, Frederick, Omaha, Neb.
 Curriek, Max C., Erie, Pa.
 Deinard, Samuel N., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Deutsch, G. Cincinnati, O.
 Ettelson, Harry W, Hartford, Conn.
 Feuerlicht, Jacob, Chicago, Ill.
 Foster, Solomon, Newark, N. J.
 Fox, G. George, Ft. Worth, Tex.
 Franklin, Leo M., Detroit, Mich.
 Freund, Charles J., Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Friedman, Wm. S., Denver, Col.
 Frisch, Ephraim, Pine Bluff, Ark.
 Goldenson, Samuel H., Albany, N. Y.
 Gries, Moses J., Cleveland, O.
 Heller, Maximillian, New Orleans, La.
 Hirshberg, Samuel, Chicago, Ill.
 Kornfeld, Joseph S., Columbus, O.
 Lefkovits, Maurice, Duluth, Minn.
 Lefkowitz, David, Dayton, O.
 Levi, Charles S., Peoria, Ill.
 Levy, Abraham R., Chicago, Ill.
 Mannheimer, Eugene, Des Moines, Ia.
 Marcuson, Isaac E., Charleston, S. C.
 Marx, David, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mayer, Harry H., Kansas City, Mo.
 Merritt, Max J., Evansville, Ind.
 Morgenstern, Julian, Cincinnati, O.
 Philipson, David, Cincinnati, O.

Rappaport, Julius, Chicago, Ill.
 Rauch, Joseph, Sioux City, Ia.
 Rosenau, Wm., Baltimore, Md.
 Rosenwasser, Herman, Baton Rouge, La.
 Rothstein, Leonard J., Alexandria, La.
 Rypins, Isaac L., St. Paul, Minn.
 Schanfarber, Tobias, Chicago, Ill.
 Schulman, Samuel, New York City.
 Silber, Mendel, Albuquerque, N. M.
 Singer, Jacob, York, Pa.
 Stolz, Joseph, Chicago, Ill.
 Witt, Louis, Little Rock, Ark.
 Zepin, George, Cincinnati, O.
 Zielonka, Martin, El Paso, Tex.

During the Convention, communications and greetings were received from Rabbis Henry Barnstein, Henry Englander, Adolph Guttmacher, Jacob H. Kaplan, Jacob Klein, Isidore Lewinthal, Marcus Salzman, Nathan Stern, and Leopold Wintner and from Mr. Claude G. Montefiore and Hon. Simon Wolf.

Upon motion the President was instructed to reply to the cable of Mr. Montefiore.

The message of the president, Rabbi Max. Heller, was then read (cf. Appendix A.), and on motion was received with thanks and referred to the Committee on President's Message.

The report of the Corresponding Secretary, Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, was presented.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your Corresponding Secretary begs leave to report that he has performed the duties of his office to the best of his ability. If there were any shortcomings, this was due to the fact that the work of this office has so multiplied within the last two or three years that it is no longer possible to handle it adequately without the help of a permanent clerk.

Three communications were sent to each of our members during the year and four special letters to Chairmen of Committees. Four abstracts were sent to the Jewish newspapers and two articles dealing with the Tract and Relief Funds written for them.

Year Books, Tracts, and Reprints were distributed gratis upon request, in addition to our usual mailing list. Among the requests for free literature granted may be mentioned as of special interest those of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Allegheny, Pa., and of Tufts College Medford, Mass.; also those of the Sandusky, O., Jewish community and

of the Jewish Ladies Aid Society, Braddock, Pa., both for self-instruction, and of Isaac Jacobs, Melbourne, Australia, for propaganda purposes within the Jewish camp. Copies of the pamphlet, "Why the Bible Should Not Be Read in the Public-Schools," were sent to the members of the School Board of Toledo, O., and of the Pennsylvania Legislature, where they were then needed. 317 Prayer Books were distributed free among ten penal and eleemosynary institutions.

Contributions to the Relief and Tract Funds, a new department of this office, were promptly acknowledged and recorded.

Your Secretary desires to call your attention to the following conditions which need remedying:

1. The duties of the office of Corresponding Secretary are becoming too burdensome and exhausting for one man to perform without the aid of a permanent clerk. In the last few years the Conference has broadened the field of its endeavors enormously and the new duties resultant have practically all been added to the Secretary's office. He has to keep in touch with 32 Committees, with all the members, with the editors of the Year Book, with our Book Agents, with the President, the Treasurer and the Recording Secretary. He has charge of free distributions of our literature and must keep the accounts of the Tract and Relief Funds receipts. These and a host of other lesser duties can not be discharged on the allowance of twenty-five dollars a month now permitted him which, be it remembered, must cover postage, stationery, expressage and sundry other expenses as well as stenographic charges. That the Corresponding Secretary this season, like his predecessors in former years, got along on less than this sum is due to the fact that he did much menial clerical labor with his own hands to the detriment of his own personal and congregational duties. Under the present conditions he has to go down town to find a stenographer, taking his chance at finding the stenographer busy. He has to dictate every word because the stenographer is not conversant with the affairs of the office. The present system is not only vexatious to the Secretary; it is in addition by no means economical. \$205 was spent this year for stenographic services, for addressing, handling, etc., by the Secretary and by Committees on work that could have been done just as well by a permanent clerk. The difficulties enumerated are accentuated by the change of Secretaries every two years and sometimes, as in the last administration, every year. Confusion is thus worse confounded. It takes the new Secretary three or four months to become familiar with his duties. The public and even our membership does not know who is Secretary and people are still addressing their letters and their bills to former Secretaries. In short the machinery of this office is no longer equal to the demands made upon it.

Your Secretary therefore recommends (a) that the office of Corresponding Secretary be made a permanent one (b) that the allowance for office expenses be increased so as to admit of the engaging of a permanent

clerk or at least of regularly recurring clerical services; or, as an alternative for the latter, that some of the duties, like the handling of Tract and Relief Funds receipts, be transferred from his office to that of the Treasurer or some other appropriate office.

2. There is too much delay in getting out the Year Book, a circumstance which paralyzes the activities of Officers and Committees. This evil is due in part to the failure of Chairmen to hand in enough type-written copies of their reports, and of writers of papers and leaders of discussion to hand in a sufficient number of copies of their material to the Secretary of the Conference; and also to dilatoriness in reading proofs and returning the same to the Editors; in part to the inexcusable failure to acknowledge Committee appointments and other communications from the Secretary by our members. Four copies of all papers to be printed are needed by the Secretary and Editors.

3. Committee work for the most part seems to be hastily and therefore poorly done and sometimes not done at all. This is due to the late appearance of the Year Book, the dulling of the sense of responsibility on the part of some Chairmen and, most of all, the indifference or carelessness of the large majority of our members. Your Secretary is of the opinion that many of our members are not moved by a high enough spirit of service in their relation towards the Conference, whether the test be tasks entrusted to them for performance or attendance at the Conference.

Your Secretary is glad to turn from blame to praise and to say that his experience with the Officers of the Conference was most delightful. He also desires to state that he is highly pleased with the uniform courtesy, efficiency and helpfulness of our Book Agents, the Bloch Publishing Co.

The following 109 Vouchers amounting to \$2,336.79 have been issued by me from July 5th, 1910 to June, 1911, inclusive. These include Vouchers Nos. 963 to 978 inclusive, issued since June 10th, which are not noted in the Treasurer's Annual Report, as our Fiscal year ends on that date. On the other hand, they do *not* include Voucher No. 868 issued by my predecessor before I assumed the duties of my office.

1910 Voucher No.

July 5,	869 Young Israel, Year Book, reprints, etc.....	\$1,197.36
	870 Julian Morgenstern account Charlevoix Conference	18.05
	871 Publishers Printing Co., binding.....	301.60
	872 Cent. Trust & Safe Dep. Co., storage archives....	10.00
	873 Montag Bros., printing	10.00
	874 David Marx, Cor. Sec'y.....	12.47
	875 Bloch Pub. Co., expressage.....	1.85
July 9,	876 J. G. Hauser, printing.....	15.00
	877 Pension	25.00
	878 Pension	15.00
July 27,	879 F. H. Jones, expressage, Conf. Exhibit.....	3.60
	880 Nat. Vaudeville Film Co., Moving Picture Show...	26.40

	881 Harry Weiss, Social and Religious Union Committee	2.68
	882 Publishers Printing Co., Personal Prayers Proofs.	87.75
Aug. 18,	883 Leland B. Case, stenographic services	100.00
	884 Smith Print Co., stationery	12.75
	885 Pension	25.00
	886 Pension	15.00
	887 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y	5.90
	888 Mrs. M. Goldsmith	250.00
Sept. 6,	889 Pension	25.00
	890 Pension	15.00
	891 Publishers Print. Co., binding	562.42
Sept. 26,	892 J. D. Eisenstein, 3 vol. Hebrew Encyclopedia, subvention	9.00
	893 Julian Morgenstern account Year Book	5.00
Oct. 7,	894 Pension	25.00
	895 Pension	15.00
	896 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y	15.85
	897 Publishers P. Co., presswork & paper, new ed. P. B. and Hymnal binding, etc.	1,147.00
Oct. 27,	898 George Zepin, account Prayer Book Sales Committee	20.25
	899 George Zepin, account Sermonic Lit. Com.	98.82
	900 George Zepin, account Com. Church & State, Holiday Press Notices	16.97
	901 Starchroom Pub. Co., account Solicit. Com.	15.63
Nov. 7,	902 Pension	15.00
	903 Pension	25.00
	904 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y	16.59
Nov. 22,	905 Wm. Friedman, Exec. Com. Meeting, Cincinnati	40.00
	906 David Marx, Exc. Com. Meeting & Edit. Year Book	28.12
	907 Louis Witt, Exc. Com. Meeting	24.00
	908 E. Frisch, Exec. Com. Meeting	25.00
	909 Publishers Print Co., Binding	186.61
Nov. 25,	910 Leo M. Franklin, Exec Com. Meeting	9.50
	911 Leo M. Franklin, Lyceum Bureau	50.00
Dec. 12,	912 I. L. Rypins, Exc. Com. Meeting	22.50
	913 Morris Rose, insurance on plates	23.98
	914 Pension	15.00
	915 Pension	25.00
	916 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y	24.35
Dec. 21,	917 Max. Heller, Exec. Com. Meeting & expressage	27.25
	918 M. J. Gries, Exec. Com. Meeting	8.00
1911.		
Jan. 5,	919 Pension	15.00
	920 Pension	25.00

		921 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y.....	11.10
		922 West Pub. Co., 15 Wisconsin Sup. Court Decisions.....	3.75
Jan. 14,		923 F. H. Jones, expressage on "Exhibit".....	5.91
		924 Publishers' Printing Co., galley proofs, Personal Prayers.	4.80
		925 Starchroom Pub. Co., printing.....	13.00
		926 George Zepin, postage, Hanukkah notices.....	11.44
		927 Dept. Synagog & School Extension, clerical and Hanukkah notices.	1.50
Feb. 1,		928 Wm. Fineshriber, Exec. Comm. Meeting.....	17.50
		929 Israel Aaron, Exec. Com. Meeting.....	16.50
		930 David Marx, Mailing expenses, Year Book, 1910..	100.00
		931 Colonial Printing Co., printing.....	2.65
		932 E. Frisch, Second ½ expenses, Ex. Com. Meeting, Cincinnati	25.00
		933 E. Frisch, Full expenses, Exec. Com. Meeting, New York	116.00
Feb. 9,		934 Pension	15.00
		935 Pension	25.00
		936 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y.....	16.05
Feb. 19,		937 Joseph Stolz, Exec. Comm. Meeting.....	8.00
		938 Publishers Print. Co., binding.....	137.24
Mar. 1,		939 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y.....	24.73
		940 Pension	15.00
		941 Pension.	25.00
Apr. 4,		942 J. D. Eisenstein, 3 copies Vol. 5, Heb. Ency., subvention	9.00
		943 Julian Morgenstern, Postage, Solicit, Com.....	25.00
		944 Publishers Printing Co., 250 proofs Personal Prayers, postage & address.....	50.40
		945 Pension	25.00
		946 Pension	15.00
		947 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y.....	15.60
Apr. 17,		948 Guardian Savings & Trust Co., Freight on books.....	.60
		949 Starchroom Pub. Co., printing, etc., Solicit. Com..	41.80
Apr. 18,		950 Julian Morgenstern, Additional postage, Solicit Comm.	25.00
		951 E. C. Walton, typewriting, postage, Com. Syn. Music.	20.46
		952 H. H. Mayer, typewriting, postage, Com. Syn. Music	1.72
Apr. 21,		953 Julian Morgenstern, Return postage, Sol. Com....	25.00
Apr. 22,		954 Foote and Davies Co., printing Year Book, postage, etc.	718.42

May 1,	955 A. B. Ehrlich, subsidy 25 copies, Vol. 3, Pent. Commentary	50.00
	956 David Marx, Postage	2.00
	957 C. A. Rubenstein, Expenses to Phila., Com. Personal Prayers.	4.50
	958 Publishers Printing Co., printing & binding	397.10
	959 Publishers Printing Co., binding	74.63
	960 Pension	25.00
	961 Pension	15.00
	962 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y	15.15
May 27,	963 George Zepin, press notices, printing, Postage	20.67
	964 Starchroom Publ. Co., printing	2.50
	965 Mailing & Advertising Co., Addressing, etc., Solicitation Committee.	16.39
June 1,	966 A. Guttmacher, expenses, Pub. Comm. Meeting	13.70
	967 Julian Morgenstern, postage, solicit, comm.	9.25
	968 Starchroom Pub. Co. printing	7.50
	969 Pension	15.00
	970 Pension	25.00
	971 Ethel Schloss, postage and clerical aid	7.50
	972 Smith Printing Co., printing	5.75
	973 Smith Printing Co., printing	1.75
	974 Commercial Printing Co., printing	7.50
	975 Ethel Schloss, Postage and clerical aid	5.20
June 2,	976 E. Frisch, Cor. Sec'y	32.73
	977 S. Rosenthal and Co., Conversion certificates	12.00
	978 Adams Printing Co., printing	7.65

Respectfully submitted,

EPHRAIM FRISCH.

The report was received and on motion referred to the auditing committee with the exception of paragraph 1, which was referred to the committee on President's Message.

The report of the Recording Secretary, Rabbi Julian Morgenstern, was presented, and on motion was accepted.

REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

During the year 1910-1911 your Executive Committee held four meetings, July 4, 1910, at Charlevoix, Mich., Nov. 15-16, 1910, at Cincinnati, Jan. 16-17, 1911, at New York City, and June 30, 1911, at St. Paul, Minn. Outside of the usual and necessary routine work, and the con-

sideration of matters pertaining to the work of various committees, report of which will be presented by the respective committees, the following business was transacted.

A set of resolutions, illuminated and handsomely bound, was presented to Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, expressing the appreciation of the Conference of the privilege of his presence at, and participation in the work of the Charlevoix convention. The cost of these resolutions was borne by the members of the Executive Committee individually. A specially bound copy of the last year-book was also presented to Mr. Montefiore.

It was unanimously decided to dedicate the last year-book to the memory of Abraham Geiger, the centenary of whose birth was commemorated at the Charlevoix convention. It was likewise decided not to publish the contemplated Geiger Memorial Volume.

After careful consideration the paper prepared by Mr. B. H. Hartogensis, and incorporated in the report of the Committee on Civil and Religious Marriage Laws, was ordered printed in the last year-book.

Reprints of the papers read at the Charlevoix convention by Rabbis Berkowitz, Philipson and J. Raisin, and Mr. Montefiore, and printed in the last year-book, were ordered made and distributed as usual.

It was unanimously decided that all reports and papers hereafter presented to the Conference be typewritten and in triplicate, that papers assigned be measured both by time of reading and space (per 1000 words) in the year-book, and that all members to whom papers are assigned be informed in advance of the time and space at their disposal, and also that if they exceed these limits their paper will not be printed in the year-book.

The Conversion Certificate adopted at the Charlevoix convention, was ordered printed. Copies can be had by the members of the Conference upon application to the Corresponding Secretary.

It was unanimously decided to urge the members of the Conference in their address upon Shabbas Zachor to present to their congregations an account of the persecutions under which our brethren in foreign lands suffer.

The Sabbath School Exhibit of the Conference was ordered to be kept for the present in Cleveland, O., in the care and under the control of Rabbi Gries.

A standing committee, to cooperate with the U. A. H. C., the I. O. B. B. and the American Jewish Committee in matters of emergency consisting for this year of the President, Vice-President, and Rabbis Gries, Krauskopf and Philipson, was appointed. The committee was empowered to formulate its own name.

A committee of three, consisting of Rabbis Philipson, Heller and Stolz, was appointed to consider thoroughly the question of the present provisions for admission to membership in the Conference of applicants not holding rabbinical degrees, and if found advisable, to submit to the con-

ference during the present convention a resolution amending the Constitution in this regard.

The proposition to publish a children's service for Yom Kippur was laid on the table.

A subvention of \$50.00, the third of its kind, was granted Mr. A. B. Ehrlich, to assist him in the publication of the third volume of his "Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel." The sum of \$250.00 was ordered paid to Mrs. S. M. Goldsmith of Detroit, as the second half of the contribution of the Conference to the late Mr. S. M. Goldsmith, to assist him in the publication of "Young Israel."

During the year one member of the Conference Prof. E. Feldman passed away,—one Rabbi Emanuel Kahn, resigned, one member, Rabbi Max Schloessinger, of Hamburg, Germany, was suspended; Rabbis B. H. Kaplan, M. Lefkovits, Sessler and Warsaw were restored to good standing.

In conclusion permit me to express my appreciation of the high honor conferred upon me by the Conference during the past two years.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

Recording Secretary.

The report of the Treasurer, Rabbi Moses J. Gries, was presented, and on motion was referred to the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF TREASURER.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

A year ago at this time some confusion existed with regard to the payment of dues. Some of the members declared that they did not owe the Conference the amounts shown on the books. All of these matters have been satisfactorily adjusted, and at this time there is no difference of opinion as to the dues of each member.

I have tried to use diligence in the collection of dues without unnecessarily annoying the members. Since the meeting a year ago five sets of notices have been mailed in an attempt to collect the dues from various members of the Conference. These notices were mailed during August and October 1910, January, March and May, 1911. At this time there are 35 delinquents owing one year's dues and five delinquents owing two years' dues.

Notwithstanding the fact that all income from the publication has, this year, gone to the General Fund, this Fund shows a slight loss from last year. This is largely accounted for by the fact that the cost of publication of both the 1909 and 1910 year-books have been charged up to this year's business.

The folded voucher check which was authorized by the Conference a year ago was not put into effect, this year, owing to the fact that there was a large stock of the former vouchers on hand and it was thought advisable to exhaust this supply before ordering the new folded voucher

checks. By all means this change should be put into effect as soon as possible. This voucher should have the distribution of funds, on the back, in such a way, that the funds from which all disbursements are to be made, should be indicated on each voucher before it leaves the Secretary's office to come to the Treasurer for payment. All bills, if there are any, should be attached to this voucher, and if there are no bills, the description of the service rendered should be stated on the face of the voucher. This will produce a uniformity about the vouchers, making them much better for filing, and should prove an improvement in every way.

I recommend that a formal expression of appreciation be authorized by the Conference, to The Guardian Savings & Trust Company, of Cleveland, for their careful attention both to the records and the affairs of the Conference.

An especial vote of thanks is due to Secretary Frisch for his painstaking effort and conscientious zeal to facilitate the official business of the Conference.

I desire to express my appreciation of the honor conferred upon me in my selection as Treasurer. I have faithfully endeavored to discharge the trust reposed in me. I am compelled now to ask you to relieve me of this responsibility. I can not serve again in this capacity, and must respectfully request you to elect my successor.

It is my pleasure to report that all the books of record and the accounts are in good order. I await the instructions of the proper executive officers in order that I may promptly deliver into the custody of the newly elected Treasurer all the record books belonging to the Treasurer's office and all the monies of the Conference.

Thanking you again for the honor of the office, in which it has been my privilege to serve the Conference.

Sincerely yours,

MOSES J. GRIES,

Treasurer,

REPORT OF TREASURER FROM JUNE 17, 1910, TO JUNE 10, 1911.

1910.

RECEIPTS.

June 17, Cash on hand as shown by last annual report.... \$24,393.60

Dues.

June 24,	Louis Witt	\$10.00
	Isadore E. Philo	5.00
	Albert B. Yudelsohn	5.00
	Moise Bergman	5.00
	Louis B. Mendoza	5.00
	H. Rosenwasser	5.00
	Pizer W. Jacobs	5.00
	Max Samfield	5.00
July 25,	Moses Bittenwieser	10.00
	A. S. Isaacs	5.00

		Isadore Warsaw	15.00
		Solomon H. Bauer	5.00
Aug.	5,	Frederick E. Braun	5.00
		Julius Newman	5.00
Sept.	12,	Harry Weiss	5.00
		Jacob Klein	5.00
		B. C. Ehrenreich	5.00
Sept.	20,	A. J. Messing, Jr.,	10.00
		Louis J. Kobald	5.00
Oct.	7,	Joseph Henry Stolz	5.00
		Barnett T. Elzas	10.00
		A. S. Isaacs	5.00
Nov.	1,	David Lefkovitz	5.00
Nov.	5,	Joseph Jasin	5.00
		Elias Margolis	5.00
		Leon Volmer	5.00
Nov.	8,	Gerson B. Levi	10.00
		M. S. Levy	5.00
		S. G. Bottigheimer	5.00
Nov.	23,	M. G. Solomon	10.00
		Meyer Elkin	5.00
Dec. '22,		Emanuel Schreiber	5.00
	1911.		
Jan.	16,	Eugene Mannheimer	5.00
		Sam'l Wolfenstein	5.00
		Julius Frank	5.00
		Max Landsberg	5.00
		Harry Levi	5.00
		Moses J. Gries	5.00
		Israel Aaron	5.00
		Louis Grossman	5.00
		Simon Pizer	5.00
		George Solomon	5.00
		Jacob S. Raisin	5.00
		Max Reichler	5.00
		Isaac L. Rypins	5.00
		Frederick Cohn	5.00
		David Alexander	5.00
		Abraham Cronbach	5.00
		Leon Harrison	5.00
		Leo Mannheimer	5.00
		Harry W. Ettelson	5.00
		Samuel Schwartz	5.00
		Eli Mayer	5.00
		M. Noot	5.00

	Isadore Rosenthal	5.00
	C. A. Rubenstein	5.00
	Nathan Krass	5.00
	Kaufman Kohler	5.00
	David Philipson	5.00
	Joseph Rauch	5.00
	Bernard Sadler	5.00
	Max. Heller	5.00
	Tobias Schanfarber	5.00
	Solomon Foster	5.00
	Joseph Bogen	5.00
	Joseph Krauskopf	5.00
	Louis Stern	5.00
	Jacob B. Schwarz	5.00
	Henry Barnstein	5.00
	H. G. Enelow	5.00
	Alex Lyons	5.00
	Geo. Zepin	5.00
Jan. 18,	Saml. Marks	5.00
	Israel Klein	5.00
	Joseph Stolz	5.00
	Henry Cohen	5.00
	L. J. Rothstein	5.00
	Adolph Guttmacher	5.00
	Ephraim Frisch	5.00
	E. N. Calisch	5.00
	Jacob Singer	5.00
	Jacob Fuerlicht	5.00
Jan. 31,	Harry H. Mayer	5.00
	S. Hecht	5.00
	F. DeSola Mendes	5.00
	Max Samfield	5.00
	Sigmund Frey	5.00
	Wm. S. Friedman	5.00
	Emil Ellinger	5.00
	Morris Sessler	5.00
	Isaac E. Marcuson	5.00
	Max Raisin	5.00
	Henry Berkowitz	5.00
	M. G. Solomon	5.00
	Abram Brill	5.00
Feb. 3,	Samuel Hirshberg	5.00
Feb. 14,	Isaac Landman	5.00
	Henry M. Fisher	5.00
	J. H. Landau	5.00

	M. Friedlander	5.00
	Julian H. Miller	10.00
	Nathan Gordon	5.00
	Alter Abelson	5.00
Feb. 21,	Nathan Stern	5.00
	M. Lefkovits	15.00
	B. M. Kaplan	5.00
Mar. 9,	Sam. H. Goldenson	5.00
	William Rosenau	5.00
	Samuel Koch	5.00
	Adolph Guttman	5.00
	David Marx	5.00
	Jonah B. Wise	5.00
Mar. 29,	Julian Morgenstern	5.00
	Abraham R. Levy	5.00
	Leo M. Franklin	5.00
	Jacob H. Kaplan	5.00
Mar. 31,	Abraham S. Anspacher	5.00
	David L. Liknaitz	5.00
	J. S. Kornfeld	5.00
Apr. 5,	Joseph Blatt	5.00
	Alfred G. Moses	5.00
	Henry Englander	5.00
	Morris Newfield	5.00
	Wm. H. Fineshriber	5.00
	Abraham J. Messing, Jr	5.00
Apr. 6,	Isadore Rosenthal	5.00
	Chas. J. Freund	5.00
	Solomon C. Lowenstein	5.00
	Wm. H. Greenburg	5.00
	Montague N. A. Cohen	5.00
	Horace J. Wolf	5.00
	Jacob Meilziner	5.00
	Rudolph Grossman	5.00
	Chas. S. Levi	5.00
Apr. 12,	Louis Daniel Gross	5.00
	G. George Fox	5.00
	Louis Witt	5.00
	Louis Bernstein	5.00
	Abraham Simon	5.00
	David Neumark	5.00
	Sam'l Schulman	5.00
	Max J. Merritt	5.00
Apr. 27,	Meyer Lovitch	5.00
	Sol. L. Kory	5.00

	Theo. F. Joseph	5.00
May 6,	David Blaustein	5.00
	Louis J. Kopald	5.00
	Solomon H. Bauer	5.00
May 12,	Geo. A. Kohut.....	5.00
	Emanuel Gerechter	5.00
	David Rosenbaum	5.00
May 23,	Aaron P. Drucker	5.00
	Julius H. Meyer	5.00
	G. Deutsch	5.00
	Isador E. Philo	5.00
May 26,	Wm. Loewenberg	5.00
	Wm. Loewenberg	5.00
	Martin Zielonka	5.00
	Jacob Klein	5.00
	J. L. Magnes	5.00
	Julius Rappaport	5.00
	Abraham Hirschberg	5.00
	Morris Feuerlicht	5.00
	Sam'l N. Deinard	5.00
	Seymour G. Bottigheimer	5.00
June 6,	Frederick E. Braun	5.00
	J. Leonard Levy.....	5.00
	Martin A. Meyer	5.00
	Joseph Leiser	5.00
June 10,	Mendel Silber	5.00
	Isidore Lewinthal	5.00
	Emil W. Leipsiger	5.00
	Pizer W. Jacobs	5.00
	A. B. Yudelsohn	5.00
	Maurice H. Harris	5.00

\$930.00 \$25,323.60

Tract Fund

1910.		
July 26,	Temple Bethel, Detroit, Mich.....	\$10.00
Nov. 10,	Seligman Schloss, Detroit, Mich.....	10.00
	Mrs. L. Goldsmith, Chicago, Ill.....	1.00
	Philip Stein, Chicago, Ill.....	5.00
	Marcus Rauh, Pittsburg, Pa.....	10.00
	Isaac Strouse, Baltimore, Md.....	5.00
	M. A. Marks, Cleveland, O.....	5.00
	B. Mahler, Cleveland, O.....	10.00
	Jacques Loeb, Montgomery, Ala.....	5.00
	H. Weinstock, San Francisco, Cal.....	5.00

Nov. 23,	Louis I. Aaron, Pittsburg, Pa.	5.00
	Aaron Hahn, Cleveland, O.	10.00
Nov. 30,	Maurice J. Freiberg, Cincinnati, O.	10.00
1911.		
Jan. 31,	Isaac Bloom, Cincinnati, O.	1.00
Feb. 14,	I. W. Bernheim, Louisville, Ky.	50.00
Apr. 6,	S. Kaplan, Sandusky, O.	5.00
May 17,	Edw. Lauterbach, New York.	5.00
	Mrs. Marion L. Misch, Providence, R. I.	5.00
	Jacob H. Schiff, New York.	5.00
	Simon Guggenheim, Denver, Colo.	5.00
	Oscar S. Straus, New York.	5.00
	Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, Mo.	5.00
	J. B. Greenhut, New York.	5.00
	Abram I. Elkins, New York.	5.00
	Isaac N. Seligman, New York.	5.00
	Adolph S. Ochs, New York.	5.00
	L. A. Braham, Cleveland, O.	5.00
	Maurice Stern, New Orleans, La.	5.00
	A. E. Sims, Alexandria, La.	5.00
	Fred Lazaros, Columbus, O.	5.00
	Sam'l W. Frost, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Millander Mack, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Sigmund Rheinstrom, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Isaac M. Ullman, New Haven, Conn.	5.00
	Julius Hirschberg, Chouteau, Mont.	5.00
	Simon Spero, Birmingham, Ala.	5.00
	Felix Kahn, Hamilton, O.	5.00
	Max Kutz, Atlanta, Ga.	5.00
	B. D. Eisendrath, Chicago, Ill.	5.00
	Seligman Schloss, Detroit, Mich.	5.00
	Jacob Blank, Camden, N. J.	2.00
	Sanger Bros., Dallas, Tex.	5.00
	A. G. Morganstern, New York, N. Y.	5.00
	N. Solinger, Goshen, Ind.	5.00
	M. Levy, Omaha, Neb.	5.00
	Leon Israel Bros., New Orleans, La.	5.00
	J. B. Weil, Keokuk, Iowa.	2.50
	Mrs. E. Mandel, Chicago, Ill.	5.00
	Mrs. T. J. Eisendrath, Chicago, Ill.	5.00
	Mark M. Cohn, Little Rock, Ark.	5.00
May 17,	Eli Winkler, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
May 26,	A. B. Mier, Ligonier, Ind.	5.00

 \$321.50 \$25,645.10

Publication.

1910.

July 25,	Moses J. Gries	\$ 1.15
Aug. 26,	Bloch Publishing Co.	400.00
Oct. 7,	Bloch Publishing Co.	400.00
	I. J. Friedlander50
Nov. 1,	Bloch Publishing Co.	400.00
Nov. 10,	Bloch Publishing Co.	300.00
Nov. 23,	Bloch Publishing Co.	250.00
Nov. 30,	Bloch Publishing Co.	500.00
Dec. 22,	Bloch Publishing Co.	300.00
	Bloch Publishing Co.	400.00
	Sam Bukofzer	1.00

1911.

Jan. 10,	Bloch Publishing Co.	500.00
Jan. 18,	Bloch Publishing Co.	500.00
Feb. 21,	Bloch Publishing Co.	300.00
Mar. 29,	Bloch Publishing Co.	300.00
Apr. 12,	Morris Rose	4.00
Apr. 27,	Bloch Publishing Co.	250.00
May 10,	Bloch Publishing Co.	300.00
June 10,	Bloch Publishing Co.	372.42

 \$ 5,479.07
Interest.

1910.

Sept. 30,	The Guardian Savs. & Trust Company, interest on Regular Commercial balance to October 1, 1910.....	\$ 11.67
	The Guardian Savings & Trust Company, interest on Special balance to October 1, 1910	460.00

1911.

Mar. 31,	The Guardian Savings & Trust Company, interest on Regular Commercial balance to April 1, 1911	3.00
	The Guardian Savings & Trust Company, interest on Special Balance to April 1, 1911..	469.20

 \$ 943.87
Relief Fund.

1910.

Nov. 10,	Mrs. M. J. Freiler, Chicago, Ill.....	\$ 3.00
	Philip Stein, Chicago, Ill.	5.00
	Marcus Rauh, Pittsburg, Pa.	10.00
	Cyrus Sulzberger, New York City.....	10.00
	Congregation Beth Israel, Portland, Ore.....	25.00

	H. Weinstock, San Francisco, Cal.	5.00
	Jacob Wurmer, Chicago, Ill.	5.00
	Jacques Loeb, Montgomery, Ala.	5.00
Nov. 23,	Louis I. Aaron, Pittsburg, Pa.	5.00
	Aaron Hahn, Cleveland, O.	10.00
Nov. 30,	Maurice J. Freiberg, Cincinnati, O.	10.00
	Ike Kaufman, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00
	Ben Weil, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00
	Charles Weil, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00
	Harry Hanf, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00
	F. M. Rosenberg, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00
	Henry Marx, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00
1911.		
Jan. 31.	Isaac Bloom, Cincinnati, O.	1.00
Feb. 14.	I. W. Bernheim, Louisville, Ky.	50.00
May 17.	Edw. Lauterbach, New York	5.00
	Mrs. Marion L. Misch, Providence, R. I.	5.00
	Oscar S. Strauss, New York	5.00
	J. B. Greenhut, New York	5.00
	Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, Mo.	5.00
	Isaac N. Seligman, New York.	5.00
	L. A. Braham, Cleveland, O.	5.00
	Maurice Stern, New Orleans, La.	5.00
	Fred Lazaros, Columbus, O.	5.00
	Sam'l W. Trost, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Sigmund Rheinstrom, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Isaac M. Ullman, New Haven, Conn.	5.00
	Abe Block, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Wm. S. Ney, Kansas City, Mo.	5.00
	F. J. Ack, Dayton, O.	5.00
	Simon Guggenheim, Denver, Colo.	5.00
	Mrs. M. L. Barnett, Manning, S. C.	5.00
	Herman Goldsmith, New York	5.00
	Oscar Rosenberger, Detroit, Mich.	5.00
	Solomon S. Cohen, Philadelphia, Pa.	5.00
	Joseph Wineman, Indianapolis, Ind.	5.00
	B. Frankenberg, Toledo, O.	5.00
	Max Landauer, Milwaukee, Wis.	5.00
	Bernhard Bettman, Cincinnati, O.	5.00
	Friedman, Keiler & Co., Paducah, Ky.	5.00
	David Davidson, Sioux City, Ia.	5.00
	Max Nordhaus, Las Vegas, N. M.	5.00
	L. D. Schoenberg, Pueblo, Colorado.	5.00
	Simon Spero, Birmingham, Ala.	5.00
	Julius Hirschberg, Chouteau, Mont.	5.00

	Mrs. Mattie Rosenfeld, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	
	Isidore Newman & Son, New Orleans, La.	5.00	
	B. D. Eisendrath, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	
	M. Warley Platzek, New York City	5.00	
	Seligman Schloss, Detroit, Mich.	5.00	
	A. S. Cohen, Toledo, O.	5.00	
	Isaac Strouse, Baltimore, Md.	5.00	
	Albert G. Morgenstern, New York City.	5.00	
	N. Solinger, Goshen, Ind.	5.00	
	M. Levy, Omaha, Neb.	5.00	
	L. Israel & Bros., New Orleans, La.	5.00	
	J. B. Weil, Keokuk, Iowa	2.50	
	Mrs. Emanuel Mandel, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	
	H. Thalheimer, Hot Springs, Ark.	5.00	
	Mark N. Cohn, Little Rock, Ark.	5.00	
	Eli Winckler, Cincinnati, O.	5.00	
	A. Blockman, San Diego, Cal.	5.00	
	A. Kluber, San Diego, Cal.	5.00	
May 26,	A. B. Mier, Ligonier, Ind.	5.00	
			<hr/>
			421.50

General Expenses.

1910.			
Nov. 1,	Miss Helen Stern, Lawton, Mich.	\$ 2.00	
	Mrs. G. Loewenberg, Kosciusko, Miss.	1.00	
	Harry Freund, Honsdale, Pa.	1.00	
1911.			
Jan. 18,	Sam'l Marks10	4.10
			<hr/>
			\$32,493.64

DISBURSEMENTS.

General Expense.

1910.			
June 24,	Max. Heller	\$ 2.15	
July 23,	Julian Morgenstern	18.05	
	Central Trust & Safe Deposit Co.	10.00	
	Montag Bros.	10.00	
	David Marx	12.47	
	J. G. Hauser	15.00	
Aug. 26,	T. H. Jones	3.60	
	Natl. Vau. Film Co.	26.40	
	Harry Weiss	2.68	
Sept. 12,	Leland B. Case	100.00	
	Smith Printing Co.	12.75	
	E. Frisch	5.90	
	Mrs. S. M. Goldsmith	250.00	

Oct. 7	J. D. Einstein	9.00
	Julian Morgenstern	5.00
Nov. 1,	E. Frisch	15.85
	George Zepin	20.25
	George Zepin	98.82
	George Zepin	16.97
	Starchroom Publishing Co.	15.63
Nov. 23,	E. Frisch	16.59
Dec. 9,	David Marx	11.12
Dec. 22,	Leo M. Franklin	50.00
	E. Frisch	24.35
1911.		
Jan. 18,	E. Frisch	11.10
	West Publishing Co.	3.75
Feb. 14,	F. H. Jones	5.91
	Starchroom Publishing Co.	13.00
	Geo. Zepin	11.44
	Dept. Synagog & School Extension	1.50
	David Marx	100.00
	Colonial Printing Co.	2.65
Feb. 21,	E. Frisch	16.05
Mar. 16,	E. Frisch	24.73
Apr. 20,	J. D. Eisenstein	9.00
	Julian Morgenstern	25.00
	E. Frisch	15.60
May 6,	Guardian Savings & Trust Co.60
	Starchroom Publishing Co.	41.80
	Julian Morgenstern	25.00
	E. C. Walton	20.46
	H. H. Mayer	1.72
	Julian Morgenstern	25.00
May 17,	Arnold B. Ehrlich	50.00
	David Marx	2.00
	C. A. Rubenstein	4.50
	E. Frisch	15.15

\$ 1,178.54
Executive Committee.

1910.		
Dec. 9,	Wm. Friedman	\$ 40.00
	David Marx	17.00
	Louis Witt	24.00
	E. Frisch	25.00
Dec. 22,	Leo M. Franklin	9.50
	I. L. Rypins	22.50

1911.		
Jan. 10,	M. J. Gries	8.00
	Max. Heller	27.25
Feb. 14,	Wm. Fineshriber	17.50
	Israel Aaron	16.50
	E. Frisch	25.00
	E. Frisch	116.00
Mar. 9,	Joseph Stolz	8.00
		<hr/>
		\$ 356.25

Publication.

1910.		
July 23,	Young Israel	\$ 1,197.36
	Publishers Printing Co.	301.60
	Bloch Publishing Co.	1.85
Aug. 26,	Publishers Printing Co.	87.75
Sept. 20,	Publishers Printing Co.	562.42
Nov. 1,	Publishers Printing Co.	1,147.00
Dec. 22,	Publishers Printing Co.	186.61
	Morris Rose	23.98
1911.		
Feb. 14,	Publishers Printing Co.	4.80
Mar. 9,	Publishers Printing Co.	137.24
Apr. 20,	Publishers Printing Co.	50.40
May 6,	Foote & Davies Co.	718.42
May 17,	Publishers Printing Co.	397.10
	Publishers Printing Co.	74.63
		<hr/>
		\$ 4,891.16

Pension.

1910		
July 23,	Pension	\$ 25.00
July 23,	Pension	15.00
Sept. 12,	Pension	25.00
Sept. 12,	Pension	15.00
Sept. 20,	Pension	25.00
Sept. 20,	Pension	15.00
Nov. 1,	Pension	25.00
Nov. 1,	Pension	15.00
Nov. 23,	Pension	15.00
Nov. 23,	Pension	25.00
Dec. 22,	Pension	15.00
Dec. 22,	Pension	25.00
1911		
Jan. 18,	Pension	15.00
Jan. 18,	Pension	25.00
Feb. 21,	Pension	15.00

Feb. 21,	Pension	25.00	
Mar. 16,	Pension	15.00	
Mar. 16,	Pension	25.00	
Apr. 20,	Pension	25.00	
Apr. 20,	Pension	15.00	
May 17,	Pension	25.00	
May 17,	Pension	15.00	
			<hr/>
			\$440.00

Cash on hand:

General Fund	\$ 4,996.09	
Relief Fund	20,258.10	
Tract Fund	373.50	
		<hr/>
		\$25,627.69
		<hr/>
		\$32,493.64

SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Receipts.

Cash on hand as per last report	\$24,393.60	
Dues	930.00	
Tract Fund	321.50	
Publication	5,479.07	
Interest	943.87	
Relief Fund	421.50	
General Expense	4.10	
		<hr/>
		\$32,493.64

Disbursements

General Expense	1,178.54	
Executive Committee	356.25	
Publication	4,891.16	
Pension	440.00	
Cash on hand:		
General Fund	\$ 4,996.09	
Relief Fund	20,258.10	
Tract Fund	373.50	25,627.69
		<hr/>
		\$32,493.64

Statement of General Fund

June 10, Balance	\$5,001.94	
One-half dues	\$ 465.00	
One-half interest	471.93	
Entire publication	587.91	\$1,524.84
Less:		
General Expense	1,174.44	
Executive Committee's Expense	356.25	1,530.69
		<hr/>
Loss		5.85
		<hr/>
Present Balance		\$4,996.09

Statement of Relief Fund.

1910.		
June 10,	Balance	\$19,339.66
	One-half Dues	\$465.00
	One-half Interest	471.94
		<hr/>
		\$936.94
	Less:	
	Pensions	440.00
		<hr/>
	Gain	496.94
	Contributions	421.50
	Total increase	918.44
	Present Balance	\$20,258.10

Statement of Tract Fund.

1910.		
June 10,	Balance	\$ 52.00
	Donations	321.50
		<hr/>
	Present Balance	\$373.50

Summary of Funds.

General Fund	\$ 4,996.09
Relief Fund	20,258.10
Tract Fund	373.50
Cash on hand as per Statement.....	<hr/> \$25,627.69

Respectfully Submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES,

Treasurer.

June 10th, 1911.

The report of the Solicitation Committee was then read by the Chairman, Rabbi Julian Morgenstern.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION OF FUNDS.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your committee, to which was entrusted the task of soliciting contributions to the Conference Relief and Tract Funds, begs leave to present the following report:

The work of this Committee was of pioneer nature, never before undertaken by the Conference, and because of its purely business and financial aspect, presented peculiar difficulties to rabbis, whose reputation for business acumen is proverbial. It followed therefore that the work had to be begun on altogether theoretical and experimental lines, and methods of procedure developed gradually through increasing experience.

A beginning was made by directing an appeal for contributions to some four hundred representative Jews of America who have been regular recipients of our year-books, and who are therefore presumably fairly well acquainted with the work of the Conference. The response was on the whole disappointing. Evidently not all the recipients of the year-book read it sufficiently to familiarize themselves with, or interest themselves in the work of the Conference.

However this beginning serves at least to demonstrate that a list of names must be prepared of persons to whom an appeal might be made with reasonable assurance of success. Accordingly a circular letter with cards, was sent to each member of the Conference with a request to return the names of a specified number of members of his congregation or of his vicinity, who in his opinion might be willing to assist in this work. As a rule the number of names requested was based upon the last report of congregational membership. To this request sixty-eight of our members responded, a rather larger proportion than usual, yet in view of the nature of the work, by no means as many as should have done so. In almost every case more than the specified number of names was sent in. In consequence we have now a well-selected list of the names of 1183 coreligionists, to whom one appeal has already been made, with a fair measure of success, and whom we propose to approach again next year.

Finally an appeal for contributions was made to the various congregations to which our members minister.

In every case it was urged that the contribution be in the form of an annual donation. To this the majority of the contributors have responded favorably. The Conference is thereby assured of a permanent annual income to the two funds, that may well serve as the nucleus for future growth.

As the result of the several appeals the following contributions from individuals have been received:

Name	Annual Contributions.	
	Relief Fund	Tract Fund
Louis I. Aaron, Pittsburg, Pa.	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00
F. J. Asch, Dayton, O.	5.00	
Morris Adler & Co., Birmingham, Ala.	5.00	
Max Adler, New Haven, Conn.		5.00
Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, Mo.	5.00	5.00
Mrs. M. L. Barnett, Manning, S. C.	5.00	5.00
I. W. Bernheim, Louisville, Ky.	50.00	50.00
Bernhard Bernheim, Louisville, Ky.	5.00	5.00
Bernhard Bettman, Cincinnati, O.	5.00	
Jacob Blank, Camden, N. J.		2.00
Abe Bloch, Cincinnati, O.	5.00	
Isaac Bloom, Cincinnati, O.	1.00	1.00
A. L. Blumberg, Kalamazoo, Mich.	5.00	5.00

Braddock Lodge, I. O. B. B., Braddock, Pa.		5.00
L. A. Braham, Cleveland, O.	5.00	5.00
A. A. Becker, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	5.00
A. S. Cohen, Toledo, O.	5.00	
Mark M. Cohn, Little Rock, Ark.	5.00	5.00
David Davidson, Sioux City, Iowa.	5.00	
B. D. Eisendrath, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	5.00
Mrs. T. J. Eisendrath, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	5.00
Abram I. Elkus, Brooklyn, N. Y.		5.00
B. Frankenberg, Toledo, O.	5.00	
J. Walter Freiberg, Cincinnati, O.		10.00
Maurice J. Freiberg, Cincinnati, O.	10.00	10.00
Mrs. M. J. Freiler, Chicago, Ill.	3.00	
Gustave Freund, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	5.00
Friedman, Keiler & Co., Paducah, Ky.	5.00	
Morris H. Flarsheim, Louisville, Ky.	5.00	5.00
Herman Goldsmith, New York City.	5.00	
J. B. Greenhut, New York City.	5.00	5.00
Max Greif, Baltimore, Md.	5.00	5.00
Simon Guggenheim, Denver, Col.	5.00	5.00
Chas. J. Haase, Memphis, Tenn.	5.00	5.00
Hugo Hartman, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	5.00
Sam Haas, Louisville, Ky.	5.00	
M. M. Hirsh, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	
Julius Hirshberg, Chouteau, Mont.	5.00	5.00
Meyer Hollander, Baltimore, Md.	5.00	5.00
Leon Israel & Bros, New Orleans, La.	5.00	
Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Galesburg, Ill.	5.00	5.00
Felix Kahn, Hamilton, O.		5.00
Henry Kahn, Indianapolis, Ind.	5.00	
S. Kaplan, Sandusky, O.		5.00
Mrs. L. Kohns, New York City.	5.00	
Max Kutz, Atlanta, Ga.		5.00
Ladies' Auxiliary, I. O. B. B., Braddock, Pa.	5.00	
Max Landauer, Milwaukee, Wis.	5.00	
Edward Lauterbach, New York City.	5.00	5.00
Fred Lazarus, Columbus, O.	5.00	5.00
M. Levy, Omaha, Neb.	5.00	5.00
J. Louis Loeb, LaFayette, Ind.	5.00	
Millard Mack, Cincinnati, O.		5.00
Ralph W. Mack, Cincinnati, O.		5.00
Mrs. Emanuel Mandel, Chicago, Ill.	5.00	5.00
Mrs. Marion L. Misch, Providence, R. I.	5.00	5.00
Albert G. Morgenstern, New York City.	5.00	5.00

L. Z. Morris, Richmond, Va.....	5.00	
Isidore Newman & Sons, New Orleans, La.....	5.00	
William S. Ney, Kansas City, Mo.....	5.00	
Max Nordhaus, Las Vegas, N. M.....	5.00	
Adolph S. Ochs, New York City.....		5.00
Leo Pfeifer, Little Rock, Ark.....	5.00	5.00
M. Warley Platzek, New York City.....	5.00	
Sigmund Rheinstrom, Cincinnati, O.....	5.00	5.00
Oscar Rosenberger, Detroit, Mich.....	5.00	
Mrs. Mattie Rosenfeld, Chicago, Ill.....	5.00	
Jacob Roth, Orange, N. J.....	5.00	
Abraham Rothschild, Newark, N. J.....	5.00	
Sanger Bros., Dallas, Tex.....		5.00
Louis Schlesinger, Newark, N. J.....		5.00
Seligman Schloss, Detroit, Mich.....	5.00	15.00
L. D. Schoenberg, Pueblo, Col.....	5.00	
Mrs. C. H. Schwab, Chicago, Ill.....		5.00
Jacob H. Schiff, New York City.....	5.00	5.00
Isaac N. Seligman, New York City.....	5.00	5.00
A. E. Simon, Alexandria, La.....		5.00
N. Solinger, Goshen, Ind.....	5.00	5.00
Simon Spiro, Birmingham, Ala.....	5.00	5.00
Philip Stein, Chicago Ill.....	5.00	5.00
Maurice Stern, New Orleans, La.....	5.00	5.00
Nat Stone, Milwaukee, Wis.....	5.00	
Oscar S. Strauss, New York City.....	5.00	5.00
Isaac Strouse, Baltimore, Md.....	5.00	5.00
H. Tallheimer, Hot Springs, Ark.....	5.00	
Samuel W. Trost, Cincinnati, O.....	5.00	5.00
Isaac N. Ullman, New Haven, Conn.....	5.00	5.00
Julius N. Visanska, Charleston, S. C.....	5.00	
Charles Weil, Pine Bluff, Ark.....	5.00	
J. B. Weil, Keokuk, Ia.....	2.50	2.50
Harris Weinstock, San Francisco, Cal.....	5.00	5.00
Jacob Wineman, Indianapolis, Ind.....	5.00	
Isidore Wise, Hartford, Conn.....		5.00
Otto Irving Wise, San Francisco, Cal.....	5.00	5.00
Jacob Wurmser, Chicago, Ill.....	5.00	

Total	\$436.50	\$355.50
-----------------	----------	----------

Single Contributions.

Relief Fund. Tract Fund.

A. Blochman, San Diego, Cal.....	5.00	
Phil Carpeles, Milwaukee, Wis.....		5.00

Solomon Solis Cohen, Philadelphia, Pa.	5.00	
Mrs. L. Goldsmith, Chicago, Ill.		1.00
Moses J. Gries, Cleveland, O.	5.00	5.00
Aaron Hahn, Cleveland, O.	10.00	10.00
Harry Hanf, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00	
Ike Kaufman, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00	
A. Klauber, San Diego, Cal.	5.00	
Jaques, Loeb, Montgomery, Ala.	5.00	5.00
B. Mahler, Cleveland, O.		5.00
Martin A. Marks, Cleveland, O.		5.00
Henry Marx, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00	
A. B. Meier, Ligonier, Ind.	5.00	5.00
Marcus Rauh, Pittsburg, Pa.	10.00	10.00
F. M. Rosenberg, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00	
Cyrus Sulzberger, New York City.	10.00	
Eli Winckler, Cincinnati	5.00	5.00
Ben Weil, Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.00	

Total	\$90.00	\$61.00
-------------	---------	---------

Total contributions of individuals.

	Relief Fund.	Tract Fund.
Annual contributions	\$436.50	\$355.50
Single contributions	90.00	61.00

Total	\$526.50	\$416.50
-------------	----------	----------

The following contributions have also been received from congregations;

Annual Contributions.

	Relief Fund.	Tract Fund.
Anshe Chesed, Vicksburg, Miss.	\$ 20.00	\$ 10.00
Anshe Emeth, Pine Bluff, Ark.	10.00	5.00
Beth El, Helena, Ark.	2.00	
Mt. Sinai, Sioux City, Ia.	5.00	5.00
Rodeph Shalom, Philadelphia, Pa. ..	25.00	25.00
Shomer Emunim, Toledo, O.	10.00	
Sinai, New Orleans, La.		10.00

Total	\$ 72.00	\$ 55.00
-------------	----------	----------

Single Contributions.

Relief Fund. Tract Fund.

Beth Israel, Portland, Ore.	\$25.00	
B'nai Yehudah, Kansas City, Mo.	25.00	\$25.00
Indianapolis, Hebrew, Indianapolis, Ind.	15.00	10.00
Shomer Emunim, Toledo, O.	5.00	10.00
Temple de Hirsch, Seattle, Wash.	10.00	5.00

Total.	\$75.00	\$45.00
-------------	---------	---------

Total contributions of congregations.

	Relief Fund.	Tract Fund.
Annual contributions	\$ 72.00	\$ 55.00
Single contributions	75.00	45.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	\$147.00	\$100.00
Total contributions		
From individuals	\$526.50	\$416.50
From congregations	147.00	100.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	\$673.50	\$516.50
Total collections.		
Total Relief Fund	\$673.50	
Total Tract Fund	516.50	
	<hr/>	
Grand Total	\$1190.00	

Of this sum all but \$35.00 have been paid.

The expenditures for the work of the Committee have been

For printing	\$ 67.18
For addressing, etc.	16.39
For postage.	84.25
	<hr/>
Total . . .	\$167.82

Total receipts	\$1,190.00
Total expenditures	167.82
Total net receipts	\$1,023.18
Gross receipts, Relief Fund	\$ 673.50
Pro rata of expenditures	83.91
Net receipts Relief Fund	\$ 589.59
Gross receipts, Tract Fund	\$516.50
Pro rata of expenditures	83.91
	<hr/>

Net Receipts of Tract Fund \$ 32.59

In view of the comparatively small expenditure, and particularly of the fact that \$919.00 are in the form of annual contributions, to be collected in the future at a nominal cost, we feel that the results of this first year's activity are quite satisfactory. It is still too early to fix a definite sum for each fund, toward the attainment of which we must strive. The two funds are still too young for their needs to be finally determined at present. It suffices to have made a good beginning, that augurs well for the future.

It is essential that the Conference realize that we have to do here not with theology, but with business and with business men, and that the

work of this Committee must be conducted upon strictly business lines. The more earnest workers there are, the greater is the promise of success. The Committee realizes, and hereby expresses its appreciation of the fact that much of this year's accomplishment has been due to the individual support of our members, or at least of sixty-eight of them. It is to be hoped that in the future an even heartier support from a larger number of members will be accorded the Committee.

With the approval of the Conference we would offer the following suggestions for the future guidance of this Committee:

1. The names of all contributors to the two funds should be printed in the year book.

2. A copy of the year book should be sent to each contributor.

3. A detachable subscription blank for contributions to the Tract Fund should be printed with each tract, together with a presentation, on the inner page of the cover, of the aims and needs of the Conference in this tract work.

4. The Committee should begin its work very early in the fall, in order that the first appeal for contributions of the year, in whatever form it take, may be made at the time of the high holidays, Rosh Hashona and Yom Kippur.

5. The Committee should ascertain the exact time when the board of directors of each congregation, ministered to by our members, holds its budget meeting, in order that the appeal for congregational contributions may be made at the proper time.

6. A particular effort should be made by our members to have the Relief and Tract Funds remembered, along with other worthy institutions, in wills and bequests, whenever opportunity offers.

7. In view of the fact that much of the work of this Committee must be largely of a clerical nature, suitable provision should be made as soon as possible for the employment of proper clerical help.

For the coming year the Committee proposes to follow in the main the methods pursued this past year. As strong an appeal as possible will be sent to those persons whose names are upon our lists, and from whom no response has been thus far received, and to others whose names we may obtain from those members of the Conference who are not yet numbered among the loyal 68.

It were well if a new tract could be issued this year, and in time to be sent out with our next appeal. This would add force to the appeal and also prove an economical means of distributing the tract.

In conclusion we beg to remind our members again that the actual success of this work depends in the last measure upon their support, individually and collectively, by answering all inquiries as promptly and fully as possible, and by seconding all appeals to their congregations and members whole-heartedly and actively. There is no reason why, if but prop-

erly conducted and supported, the work of this Committee should not put the Relief and Tract Funds upon an independent basis, leaving the Conference free to pursue its other activities and develop unhampered by financial difficulties.

Respectfully submitted,

EPHRAIM FRISCH,
MOSES J. GRIES,
JOSEPH STOLZ,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
MAX. HELLER,
JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

Chairman.

The financial portions of the report were referred to the Auditing Committee.

Recommendation I was adopted.

It was moved to amend Recommendation II by striking out the words "the year-book," and inserting the words "this report." Upon motion the recommendation with its amendment was referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation III was referred to the Tract Committee with instructions to carry out the suggestion contained therein.

The remainder of the report was adopted.

During the discussion of the report the question was raised of the advisability of appealing for contributions to the Conference Relief and Tract Funds to congregations not ministered to by members of the Conference. This question was referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Joseph S. Kornfeld then read a paper on "Ludwig Philippon, in Honor of the Centenary of His Birth," (Appendix C.) The discussion was led by Rabbi Mendel Silber (Appendix C, end) and participated in by Rabbis Philippon and Deutsch and closed by Rabbi Kornfeld.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON.

The following committee appointments were announced:

President's Message—Rabbi Jos. Stolz, chairman; Rabbis Deinand, Foster, Franklin, Friedman, Gries, Levi, Philipson, Rypins, Schanfarber, Schulman and Witt.

Nominations—Rabbi Marx, chairman; Rabbis Alexander, Ettelson, Freund, Kornfeld, Mayer, Rauch, Rosenau, Rothstein.

Resolutions—Rabbi Berkowitz, chairman; Rabbis Hirshberg, Rappaport, Silber, Witt and Zielonka.

Auditing—Rabbi Zepin, chairman; Rabbis Fox, A. R. Levy, Marcuson, Morgenstern.

Memorial Resolutions—Rabbi Deutsch, chairman; Rabbis F. Cohn, Goldenson, M. Lefkowitz, Singer.

Thanks—Rabbi Aaron, chairman; Rabbis Feuerlicht, Kornfeld, Mannheimer, Merritt.

Press—Rabbi D. Lefkowitz, chairman; Rabbis Deinard, Frisch. Rauch and Rypins.

Special Committee on the Recommendations contained in the paper of Rabbi Schanfarber; Rabbi Schulman, chairman; Rabbis Berkowitz, C. S. Levi, and Zepin.

In the absence of its chairman, Rabbi Adolph Guttmacher, the report of the Publication Committee was read by Rabbi Solomon Foster.

REPORT OF THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Publication committee begs leave to submit the report for the fiscal year, June 1st, 1910, to June 1st, 1911.

Last year's report showed a falling off of 20 per cent. on the sales of previous years. This year, we are glad to state, that the sale of our publications is 10 per cent. larger than last year. The prayer book has been introduced, during the last year, by five congregations, and now 283 congregations and 20 institutions use the book. Since the adoption of the prayer book, 17 years ago, 115,876 copies have been sold.

New editions of the prayer book, hymnal and Haggadah, authorized by the Conference, have been published. The second edition of the Haggadah is an improvement on the first, as far as the appearance of the book is concerned. The English text is printed from electro-type plates and new halftones replace the blurred illustrations of the first edition. In this connection, the Committee recommends, (1) a thorough revision of the music. Enough copies of the Haggadah are on hand for the next three or four years, which will give ample time to have the revision made by the very best people.

At its last meeting, the Conference decided to withdraw from sale the Sabbath evening and morning services. Letters from congregations and individuals have reached us asking the Conference to reissue the book. After careful thought, the Committee favors the republication of the Sabbath evening and morning services and recommends (2) that the price of the book be raised from 25 cents to 35 cents; also that the price of the week-day services be similarly raised from 25 cents to 35 cents.

The Conference sanctioned, as an experiment, the sending out of prayer books on approval to congregations prior to the holy days in the autumn. Your agent recommends (3) its discontinuance, and the Committee unanimously favors that recommendation. The experiment has proven a financial loss. The Committee recommends (4) that our agent circularize the congregations a month before the holy days, calling attention to the replenishing of the stock of prayer books.

The recommendation of our agent that the discount of 20 per cent. granted to congregations be only given when books are ordered in lots of at least five, the Committee indorses (5).

The Committee also recommends (6) that the cost of the year book be charged to all, except to Rabbis and professors and students of theological schools and libraries.

The Committee recommends (7) that part of the next edition of the prayer book be printed on Bible paper. The two parts of our prayer book printed on Bible paper would be less bulky than one part in use now. The expense of printing on Bible paper will be about 50 to 60 per cent. more, which will be materially reduced by binding both parts in one volume.

The Committee recommends (8) that in view of the fact that the Conference co-operates with the Union of American Hebrew congregations in the publication and distribution of holy day sermons, that some method may be devised for a still closer co-operation in the publication and distribution of all the publications of the Conference. The Committee recommends (9) that a committee be appointed by this Conference to meet a similar committee to be appointed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to bring about, if possible, such closer co-operation.

The report of your agent, which is appended, has been carefully gone over by your Committee.

Books delivered	\$8,205.69
Sales	6,005.20
Remittances in cash	5,472.42
Charged to Conference	368.58
Balance due June 1st, 1911	841.88
Stock on hand	2,307.85

Rabbi S. Foster, a member of the Committee, has made inventory of the stock and it tallies with the inventory made by our agent.

The Publishers Printing Company, with whom are stored our plates and unbound copies, reports as follows:

Union prayer book, Vol. 1	3,800
Union prayer book, Vol. 2	2,300
Hymnal	4,000
Haggadah	4,700
Week day services	2,000

Again we take pleasure in recommending to the Conference the renewal

of our contract for one year with the Bloch Publishing Company. We believe that in doing so we are serving the best interests of the Conference.

Fraternally yours,

S. FOSTER,

JOSEPH SILVERMAN,

MAURICE H. HARRIS,

S. H. GOLDENSON,

A. GUTTMACHER,

Chairman.

Dr. A. Guttmacher,

Chairman Publication Committee, C. C. A. R.

Dear Sir: We have the honor to submit herewith our Annual Report covering the fiscal year, June 1, 1910-May 31, 1911.

A comparison of the sales with those of the previous year shows an increase of about 10 per cent. This is due largely to the increased sale of the cloth-bound prayer books, which is about 40 per cent. higher than the previous year. We believe this increase is due largely to the withdrawal from sale of the small Sabbath Service Book.

There was a fairly large demand for the abridged Sabbath book, and it is our opinion that it would have been better to have kept it on sale, but at an increased price, as recommended by us last year. We believe that the smaller book would continue to sell in fair quantities, if retailed at 40 cents or even 50 cents. The Week Day Service book should also be raised in price from 25 cents to 40 cents or even 50 cents. The demand is not large and the Conference is justified in deriving a larger profit from its sale than heretofore.

We regret to report that the sale of the Haggadah has decreased this year by about 45 per cent. We made every effort to interest the members of the Conference in its sale, sending them special letters and offering to supply printed circulars for distribution among the members of their congregations. Only five rabbis responded. We also sent out thousands of special circulars advertising the Haggadah, at an expense which wiped out all the profit we made on the sales of this book. Whatever the cause may be for the decreased sale, it can not be for lack of effort on our part to bring the book to the attention of the general community.

Five congregations introduced the Prayer Book during the year. Those of Uniontown, Pa., Harrisonburg, Va., and Orange, N. J., discarded other rituals. We have also been advised that the congregation in Oakland, Calif. (Rabbi M. Friedlander) has adopted Volume II and will place an order for a large number of copies in time for the coming holidays.

The Publishers Printing Co. informs us that it has a sufficient number of unbound copies of the Prayer Books, Hymnal and Haggadah and there will be no need to print any of these for the coming season. If the Con-

ference decides to reprint the abridged Sabbath Service, then we would recommend that same be ordered so as to be ready by August 15.

Volume I of the stiff morocco binding, which sells at \$2.00 and which binding your Committee decided not to continue, is now about sold out. We still have 144 copies of Volume II, most of which are the old style, flexible binding, which have been reduced in price, and these we believe can be gradually disposed of. Unless otherwise instructed, we shall not continue to advertise Volume I, stiff morocco.

Previous to the holidays of last year, the Conference authorized the sending out of a special circular offering the Prayer Books to congregations, with privilege of returning unsold copies within 10 days after Yom Kippur. There were about 40 requests sent to us. About 600 books were sent out under this arrangement and about 25 per cent. were returned. Many of them came back long after the time set and in poor condition. We watched the experiment closely, and our conclusion is that it is neither practical nor profitable. We do not advise a continuance of this plan, but if the Conference decides to continue it, we trust that a limit be put upon the number of books to be ordered and returned.

We respectfully suggest and urge that we be permitted to confine the giving of the usual 20 per cent. discount to congregations and other institutions, or their representatives, only when five or more copies are ordered at a time. This will induce congregations, in order to obtain the discount, to have extra books on hand, so that their members can be promptly supplied. It will also enable us to obtain the retail price, to which we are entitled, and which we lose because so many of the retail customers order single copies through their rabbi. For their own personal use, the rabbis should continue to receive the discount price, but we believe that other individuals should pay the full price. Our retail sales are very small and we should not be deprived of the bulk of them, as we now are. We trust that you will see the justice of our claim and permit us to use our discretion in the allowing of discounts.

We venture to express the belief that our work and services, during the past year, have met with your approval. We have tried our best to serve you as efficiently and faithfully as always, and at no time losing sight of the interests of the Conference. Of this, we believe, you have had evidence sufficient to grant us a renewal of our contract.

We gratefully acknowledge the kindness and courtesies that have been extended to us by yourself, your committee and the officers of the Conference. For cordial relations that exist it is a pleasure to offer our appreciation and our thanks.

Respectfully yours,

BLOCH PUBLISHING CO.,

By Charles E. Bloch.

EXHIBIT A.

BOOKS RECEIVED JUNE 1, 1910-June 1, 1911.

1910.

June 1.	150 U. P. Books I, leather	\$1.05	157.50
June 3.	89 U. P. Books II, flexible	1.75	155.75
June 3.	89 U. P. Books I, flexible	1.75	155.75
June 7.	500 U. P. Books I, cloth70	350.00
June 8.	11 U. P. Books I, flexible	1.75	19.25
June 8.	11 U. P. Books II, flexible	1.75	19.25
Aug. 15.	197 U. P. Books I, flexible	1.75	344.75
Aug. 15.	195 U. P. Books II, flexible	1.75	341.25
Aug. 16.	257 U. P. Books I, leather	1.05	269.85
Aug. 16.	240 U. P. Books II, leather	1.05	252.00
Aug. 16.	250 U. P. Books I, cloth70	175.00
Aug. 16.	250 U. P. Books II, cloth70	175.00
Aug. 16.	500 Week-day Service17½	87.50
Aug. 18.	241 Union Hymnal30	72.30
Sep. 12.	749 U. P. Books II, cloth70	524.30
Sep. 23.	500 U. P. Books I, cloth70	350.00
Sep. 23.	500 U. P. Books II, cloth70	350.00
Oct. 3.	492 U. P. Books II, cloth70	344.40
Oct. 20.	250 U. P. Books II, cloth70	175.00
Oct. 20.	500 Union Hymnal30	150.00
Oct. 21.	300 U. P. Books I, cloth70	210.00
Nov. 5.	275 Evening and Morning Service, paper.....	.08	22.50

1911.

Jan. 10.	155 U. P. Books I, cloth70	108.50
Jan. 17.	500 U. P. Books I, cloth70	350.00
Jan. 24.	500 Union Hymnal30	150.00
Apr. 1.	500 Union Haggadahs, cloth17½	87.50
Apr. 5.	495 Union Haggadahs, cloth17½	86.62
May 9.	500 U. P. Books I, cloth70	350.00
May 24.	150 U. P. Books I, unbound56¼	84.38
May 24.	50 U. P. Books II, unbound56¼	28.12

Total..... \$5,945.97

July 28, 1910, cash 1.85

Stock on hand May 31, 1910 2,257.87

Grand total ... \$8,205.69

EXHIBIT B.

STOCK INVENTORY MAY 31, 1911.

473 Union Prayer Book I, cloth	\$.70	\$331.10
70 Union Prayer Book I, leather	1.05	73.50
11 Union Prayer Book I, morocco	1.40	15.40
16 Union Prayer Book I, extra morocco	1.75	28.00
270 Union Prayer Book II, cloth70	189.00
511 Union Prayer Book II, leather	1.05	536.55
144 Union Prayer Book II, morocco	1.40	201.60
179 Union Prayer Book II, extra morocco	1.75	313.25
54 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service17½	9.45
267 Week Day Service17½	46.73
395 Union Hymnal30	118.50
400 Union Haggadah, cloth17½	70.00
351 Union Haggadah, cloth gilt32	112.32
161 Union Haggadah, limp leather40	64.40
8 Sermons of American Rabbis, cloth85	6.80
765 Sermons of American Rabbis, paper25	191.25
Total		\$2,307.85

EXHIBIT C.

SALES FROM JUNE 1, 1910-May 31, 1911.

2382 Union Prayer Book I, cloth	\$.70	\$1,667.40
429 Union Prayer Book I, leather	1.05	450.45
55 Union Prayer Book I, morocco	1.40	77.00
313 Union Prayer Book I, extra morocco	1.75	547.75
2514 Union Prayer Book II, cloth70	1,759.80
269 Union Prayer Book II, leather	1.05	282.45
28 Union Prayer Book II, morocco	1.40	39.20
228 Union Prayer Book II, extra morocco	1.75	399.00
406 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service17½	70.75
414 Week-day Service17½	72.45
275 Evening and Morning Service, paper08	22.00
1190 Union Hymnal30	357.00
762 Union Haggadah, cloth17½	133.35
6 Union Haggadah, limp leather40	2.40
7 Sermon, cloth85	5.95
23 Sermon, paper25	5.75
150 Union Prayer Book I, unbound5625	84.38
50 Union Prayer Book II, unbound5625	28.12
Total		\$6,005.20

EXHIBIT D.

MONTHLY SALES.

1910.

June	\$ 482.73
June	64.20
July	211.92
August	374.20
September	1,604.90
October	1,045.65
November	294.15
December	342.82

1911.

January	195.65
February	295.10
March	252.00
April	270.05
May	571.83

Total.....\$6,005.20

Balance due from June 1, 1910 785.04

Grand Total\$6,790.24

REMITTANCES.

1910.

July 26	\$ 400.00
September 19	400.00
October 7	400.00
October 25	300.00
November 5	250.00
November 19	500.00
November 28	300.00
December 9	400.00
December 29	500.00

1911.

January 9	500.00
February 18	300.00
March 25	300.00

April 22	250.00
May 6	300.00
June 6	372.42
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$5,472.42
Charged to Conference (see Exhibit F).....	368.58
<hr/>	
Grand total	\$5,841.00

EXHIBIT E.

SUMMARY.

Balance due Conference June 1, 1910	\$ 785.04
Value of books received, etc., (see Exhibit A).....	8,205.69
<hr/>	
	\$8,990.73
Stock on hand (Exhibit B)	\$2,307.85
Cash remittances (Exhibit D)	5,472.42
Charged to Conference (Exhibit F)	368.58
<hr/>	
Total	\$8,148.85
<hr/>	
Balance due	\$ 841.88

Above balance represents the sales for April and May.

EXHIBIT F.

BOOKS, ETC., CHARGED TO THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

The following items consist of books sent out on orders from the Conference. Everything is charged to the Conference at the actual cost.

1910.

June 6.	Rebate on 80 U. P. Books, \$1.50 ed.....	\$.15	\$ 12.00
	To Cleveland Jewish Orphan Asylum.		
June 24.	100 U. P. Books, cloth	\$.70	70.00
	100 Union Hymnals30	30.00
	To Charlevoix, Mich. Exp.	8.35	108.35
June 27.	Expressage on Reports from Atlanta		1.85
July 6.	200 Fri. Eve. and Sab. Morn. Serv. .17½	35.00	
	Express	2.25	37.25
	To Rabbi Geo. Zepin, Charlevoix, Mich.		
Aug. 4.	85 U. P. Books, \$2.50 ed., reduced to \$2, difference of 35 cents per copy.....		28.00
Sept. 6.	Rebate on 100 U. P. Books, \$1.00 ed.....	.10	10.00
	To New Orleans Jewish Orphan Asylum.		

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

59

Sept. 10.	5 U. P. Books II, cloth, .70.....	3.50	
	Express30	3.80
	To Miss J. Mendelsohn, Baton Rouge, La.		
Sept. 10.	1 set U. P. Books, cloth	1.40	
	Express14	1.54
	To J. A. Bergman, Faupun, Wisc.		
Sept. 23.	24 U. P. Books II, cloth, .70		16.80
	To Tuberculosis Sanitarium, Winfield, Ill.		
Nov. 18.	Postage and Expressage on Year Books, Tracts, etc., from June 1 to Nov. 1, 1910		7.25
Dec. 21.	Postage and expressage on Year Books, Tracts, etc., from Nov. 1 to Dec. 21, 1910		3.92
	Total.....		<hr/> \$230.76
	1911.		
Feb. 24.	25 U. P. Books I, cloth, .70.....	17.50	
	Express50	18.00
	To State Reformatory for Girls, Hudson, N. Y.		
Feb. 24.	20 U. P. Books I, leather, \$1.05.....	21.00	
	5 U. P. Books I, morocco, \$1.40.....	7.00	
	Express45	28.45
	To Reformatory for Women, Bedford, N. Y.		
Feb. 24.	15 U. P. Books I, cloth, .70.....	10.50	
	Delivery10	10.60
	To Lakeview Home for Unmarried Mothers, City.		
Apr. 6.	75 U. P. Books I, cloth, .70.....	52.50	
	Express	1.75	54.25
	To M. F. Low, personal ser. Dept., Chicago, Ill.		
Apr. 10.	Expressage on tracts to Dr. Morgenstern		2.48
Apr. 21.	Freight and drayage on Year Books, 1910		3.68
Apr. 27.	2 Union Haggadahs, .17½35	
	Postage15	.50
	To Dr. H. Berkowitz, Philadelphia, Pa.		
May 22.	Postage and expressage on Year Books, Tracts, etc., from Jan. 1 to May 22, 1911		11.08
May 25.	40 Sab. Eve. Service, .17½.....	7.00	
	Express60	7.60
	To Raybrook Sanitarium, Raybrook, N. Y.		
May 31.	Postage on Year Books and Tracts from May 27 to May 31, 1911		1.18
	Total.....		<hr/> \$368.58

EXHIBIT G.

NEW CONGREGATIONS.

The Union Prayer Book has been introduced in the following congregations since June 1, 1910:

Phoenix, Arizona; Uniontown, Pa.; Harrisonburg, Va.; Florence, S. C.; Orange, N. J.

Upon motion the purely financial portions of the report were referred to the Auditing Committee, and the remainder was taken up seriatim.

Recommendation I was referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation II was referred to the Executive Committee for deliberate consideration.

Recommendations III and IV were referred to the Auditing Committee.

Recommendation V was not concurred in by a vote of 22-9.

Recommendation VI was referred to the Executive Committee for consideration in conjunction with recommendation II of the report of the Solicitation Committee.

Recommendation VII was referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation VIII was adopted.

Recommendation IX was referred to the Executive Committee for favorable action.

The report of the Finance Committee, Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, chairman, was presented, and on motion was received, and the last portion, referring to the appointment of a permanent secretary of the Conference, was referred to the Committee on President's Message.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

To the Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Finance begs leave to report as follows: The action of the last Conference in ordering all of the proceeds from publication transferred from the Relief and General Fund was a wise step, since, notwithstanding this additional source of revenue, there was a deficit of \$5.85 in that fund. If the outstanding bills are taken account of, the deficit amounts to approximately \$225.00. It should be noted, however, that the expenditures for publication this year were heavier than usual owing to the circumstance that both the 1909 and 1910 year books were paid for during this fiscal year (this because of the lateness of the New York Con-

ference); and that new editions of the Prayer Book, the Haggadah, and the Hymnal, all had to be printed and bound this year. This combination of circumstances reduced the revenues from publications by about \$1,000.

A healthy increase is shown by the Relief and Tract Funds which were augmented by the sum of \$1,190 this year through the energetic work of our able Solicitation Committee. Of this sum \$909 consists of annual subscriptions—an encouraging fact.

Your Finance Committee recommends that a larger allowance be put at the disposal of the Corresponding Secretary for office expenses. The welfare of the Conference and consideration for the Secretary require this, and our finances admit of it.

Respectfully submitted,

EPHRAIM FRISCH,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

DAVID MARX.

The report of the Committee on Investments was read by the chairman, Rabbi Isaac E. Marcuson, and was adopted, together with additional instructions to the Executive Committee to take under consideration the question of the amount of the Conference moneys to be deposited in any bank previous to investment.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INVESTMENTS.

To the C. C. A. R.:

Your Committee on Investments begs to report that no permanent investment was made during the past year. As shown by the Treasurer's report, the monies of the Conference are deposited in savings banks in Cleveland, Ohio, drawing 4 per cent. interest. In view of the experience of the committee, extending over many years, showing the impossibility of a committee, unable to meet and discuss the same, to agree on the best methods of investment, it would urgently recommend that the investment committee as now organized, be discontinued, and that the investment of the funds of the Conference be left to a sub-committee of the Executive Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

I. E. MARCUSON,

MOSES J. GRIES.

The report of the Committee on Pulpit Bureau, Rabbi Henry Cohen, chairman, was read, and on motion was received and ordered filed, and the Committee was discharged with thanks.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PULPIT BUREAU.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Pulpit Bureau report of last year was referred back to me as Chairman of the Committee, in order to collate the *modus operandi* of older organizations. (See Year Book 20, page 55). To this end I sent the subjoined letter to the following members of the committee: Moise Bergman, New Orleans; E. N. Calisch, Richmond; H. Englander, Cincinnati; M. Friedlander, Oakland; Wm. S. Friedman, Denver; M. H. Harris, New York; J. Rauch, Sioux City; and Geo. Zepin, Cincinnati.

"Galveston, Texas, April 26, 1911.

"I should like you, as one of the members of the Pulpit Bureau to ascertain what is being done by other religious denominations towards bringing unemployed ministers and vacant pulpits together; and what methods they pursue in the general mediation between pew and pulpit. You can easily obtain the desired information by asking a representative minister of each of the more important denominations in your vicinity.

"Our purpose is to form a permanent committee for the advantage of rabbis and congregations alike, and it is well to know how older organizations meet the problem. Your immediate attention is necessary.

"Faternally,

"(Signed) Hy. Cohen, Chairman."

Subsequent to the sending of the above letter, I addressed the following communication to a representative minister of each of the larger Christian denominations (the Roman Catholic Church excepted).

"Galveston, Texas, May 23, 1911.

"Dear Colleague: Will you be kind enough to inform me how your church brings unemployed ministers and vacant pulpits together, and what methods it pursues in the general mediation between pew and pulpit?

"An early reply will greatly oblige,

"Yours faithfully,

"(Signed) HENRY COHEN,

"Chairman, Pulpit Bureau, Central Conference of American Rabbis."

From the replies to my personal letter and to those sent to the different sects by the members of my committee, I am constrained to think that at present there exists no satisfactory arrangement to bring together unemployed ministers and vacant pulpits. All denominations seem to be groping and none of them has found the proper medium of establishing an entente cordiale between pulpit and pew. There appear to be two general systems of establishing relationship between unemployed ministers and vacant pulpits; (a) appointment of ministers by bishops, with or without the consent of the congregation and (b) independent election by the congregation. Under "a" will be found the Episcopal and the Methodist Episcopal churches. Under "b" the Baptist, Universalist, Presbyterian,

Unitarian, Christian and Lutheran churches. I notice that almost all denominations have found it expedient to engage the services of a field-secretary who keeps in touch with churches without ministers and with ministers who are without churches. His office acts as a bureau of information for church and minister.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY COHEN.

Individual reports were presented by the chairman and members of the Committee on Social and Religious Union. In the absence of the chairman it was found impossible to merge these reports into one and they were for that reason not acted upon.

The report of the Committee on Conversion Certificate was presented by the chairman, Rabbi David Philipson and on motion was adopted, and the committee was discharged with thanks. It was moved and carried that in the future the certificate be printed in triplicate, one part to be retained by the officiating rabbi, one to be given to the proselyte and the other to be filed with the Corresponding Secretary of the Conference.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONVERSION CERTIFICATE.

To the President and Members of the C. C. A. R.:

At last year's conference the report of the Committee on Certificate of Conversion was adopted. At the post-conference meeting of the Executive Committee, the chairman of the committee was instructed to have the formula adopted by the conference, printed in duplicate. This has been done and I submit herewith 500 copies of the formula printed in duplicate. This being the final step in the work of the committee, I ask that the committee be discharged.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID PHILIPSON,

Chairman.

Vice-President Schulman took the chair while Rabbi Louis Witt presented a paper on "The Basis of Membership in the American Synagog," (Appendix D²). Discussion was led by Leo M. Franklin (Appendix D²) and was participated in by Rabbi Rauch, Foster, Gries, Frisch, Deinard, Rappaport, Rosenwasser, Klein, Philipponson, Fox, Heller, C. S. Levi, Stolz, Morgenstern, Ettelson and Schulman, and was closed by Rabbi Witt.

Upon motion the recommendations contained in the paper were referred to the Committee on President's Message, of which Rabbi Witt was to be a member.

SUNDAY EVENING.

At the evening session of the Conference held in the Temple, Rabbi Goldenson conducted a round-table on the subject, "The Synagog and Social Service." The discussion was participated in by Rabbis Rosenwasser, Rypins, Philipppson, Foster, Stolz, Franklin, Friedman, Schulman, Gries, Deinard and Fox, and was closed by Rabbi Goldenson.

MONDAY MORNING, JULY 3, 1911.

The Convention was opened by President Heller. Rabbi Jacob Singer delivered the opening prayer.

The amendment to Art. 6, Sec. 3 of the Constitution, proposed at the Charlevoix Convention, to limit service on the Executive Committee to three consecutive years for all members except past-officers, was taken up as the first order of business. After considerable discussion the amendment was tabled.

The report of the Arbitration Committee was presented by the chairman, Rabbi Joseph Stolz. On motion the report was adopted.

REPORT OF THE ARBITRATION COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Arbitration is again happy to report that the services of the committee were not called into requisition a single time during the year. Apparently the relationship between our members and their respective congregations is a peaceful and harmonious one. However, it is well to remind our people annually that, if the emergency should exist, the conference stands ready to use its good influence to arbitrate any official difference that may arise between our members and the congregations they serve.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

TOBIAS SCHANFARBER.

The report of the Committee on Contemporaneous History was presented by the chairman, Rabbi Gotthard Deutsch.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY.

Your Committee on Contemporaneous History begs to report as follows:

1. That congratulations be sent to Professor Israel Lewy, of the Breslau Seminary on the occasion of the completion of his seventieth year Janu-

ary 7th, 1911, expressing appreciation of his work as one of the greatest Talmudists of the age, and the teacher of several American Rabbis.

2. That an expression of sympathy be sent to Chief Rabbi Adler of London, on the death of his son, the Reverend S. Alfred Adler, who died November 29th, 1910, and his brother Marcus Adler, who died February 25th, 1911.

3. That resolutions of regret be passed on the death of Dr. Michael Friedlander, late principal of Jew's College, London, and that a copy of the same be forwarded to Reverend Dr. M. Gaster, of London, his son-in-law, and to Jews' College, whose revered head he was for many years.

4. That similar resolutions be passed on the death of Hirsch Hildesheimer, scholar, publicist and communal worker, and that a copy of the same be transmitted to the family of the deceased, and to the Rabbiner Seminar of Berlin.

5. That similar resolutions be passed on the death of the late Rabbi Maurice Fluegel, of Baltimore, and be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

6. That in accordance with the resolutions passed last year, Sabbath Zakor be set aside as the day for preaching on the situation of the Jew in Russia; that the local press be interested in the question, with the object of giving the matter due publicity; and that the Executive Committee prepare a brief statement of the Jewish question in Russia for the information of its members.

7. That a resolution on the Russian passport question be drafted by this convention, and a copy thereof be transmitted to the President of the United States and to every member of Congress.

8(a). That in view of the recent reappearance of the "blood accusation" in Kiev, and the publicity given to it by the Associated Press, a resolution refuting this malicious slander be adopted.

(b) That a statement be drafted by the Executive Committee elucidating this question, chiefly with the purpose of furnishing information to the public press.

9. That in accordance with a previous suggestion, and in order to meet undeniable wants in the circles of the recent immigrants, evidenced by a Shabuot editorial in the Jewish Daily News on the necessity of confirmation, we recommend that Yiddish literature in the interest of Reform Propaganda be prepared by this Conference.

10. That the Executive Committee send circulars to its members requesting them to preach on the Sabbath or the Sunday preceding December 28th, on the life and the work of Ludwig Philippson. It is recommended that the Year Book be published before that time in order to give the members the opportunity to avail themselves of the information on the subject contained in it.

Respectfully submitted,

G. DEUTSCH, Chairman.

On motion the report was taken up seriatim. Recommendations I, II, III, IV and V were referred to the Committee on Memorial Resolutions. The first part of Recommendation VI was adopted. The last part, recommending that the Executive Committee prepare a statement of the Jewish question in Russia, was briefly debated. Being asked to explain the value of such a statement, Rabbi Deutsch said:

Dr. Deutsch—Everybody knows that the Jews in Russia are subject to discrimination regarding their rights of residence and the practice of their religion. What we do not know, at least not all of us, are certain important details. For instance, in 1882 there were passed the so-called May laws excluding Jews from residence in villages, and leading to such cruelties, that a man who has lived a blameless life for thirty years in a certain village and then moves away and wishes to come back, is refused re-admission to the place on no particular ground except that he is a Jew. Again, cases have occurred where a man who has lived in St. Petersburg for years, in order to maintain his residence there had to convert to Christianity and raise his children as Christians. It seems to me that such tangible facts, if presented in brief form and placed at the disposal of the members of the Conference, would materially help in the way of supplying specific information.

On motion this question was referred to the Executive Committee for careful consideration.

Recommendation VII was referred to the Committee on Church and State.

The first part of Recommendation VIII was referred to the Committee on Resolutions; the last part to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation IX was referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation X was referred to the Committee on President's Message.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

The Convention then adjourned to the Temple to hold a service in memory of the late Professor Ephraim Feldman, who was a member of the Conference. Rabbi Charles Levi delivered a eulogy on Professor Feldman at the conclusion of which the Conference recited the Kaddish.

The following resolution was then presented and adopted: "That the Committee on Memorial Resolutions prepare suitable resolutions in memory of Professor Feldman and that a separate page of the minutes be set aside for that purpose and that an engrossed copy of the same be sent to Mrs. Feldman."

A paper on "Leopold Loew, in Honor of the Centenary of His Birth" (Appendix E) was presented by Rabbi Julius Rappaport. Rabbis Philipson, Kornfeld and Mayer participated in the discussion that followed.

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

The Committee on Responsa presented an oral report which the Conference received.

The Committee on Synagogal Music, Rabbi H. H. Mayer, chairman; then presented its report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SYNAGOGAL MUSIC.

To the President and Members of the C. C. A. R.:

The most important duty devolving upon your committee on Synagogal Music was to revise the Union Hymnal.

The defects in our Union Hymn Book are painfully apparent. Many congregations refuse to adopt it in its present form, though willing to introduce it in their temples and schools when a revision that commends itself to them shall have been made. Many congregations that have adopted our present book recognize that the limited sphere of its usefulness is largely due to the glaring imperfections with which it abounds and would eagerly welcome a substitute. The drastic condemnation of our Union Hymnal, expressed in the Jewish Encyclopedia, volume 1, page 515, your chairman believes is fully justified. When we remember that our committee of two years ago, in its excellent supplementary report, graded only thirty-four of the texts and only thirty-seven of the tunes of our present book as good, and when we find that only eight numbers were graded good as to both music and text, we must conclude that we can not in approaching our problem of a revised hymnal be guided by the fine counsel of the Hebrew sage, *אכול קליבתו זרוק*, since the sifted sediment of a residuum that is left, after the worthless portions of our own book have been rejected, is too insignificant to be termed the nucleus of an improved edition. The urgent necessity that confronts us is a revision so thorough as to involve the creation of a new work. Half way measures will not suffice. A patch-work revision will not be satisfactory.

Your chairman would gladly have been spared the unpleasant duty of making these strictures, but if the errors of the past are not to be repeated, we must not shrink from a candid statement of the truth.

Previous committees have disposed of the preliminary details of a successful revision. They have analyzed the contents of our Union Hymnal and have furnished valuable critical estimates of the music and verse. They have undertaken to ascertain the authorship of the anonymous hymn-texts. They have outlined plans for a different order of arrangement. They have made some attempts to collect new poems suitable for hymns, but, failing to agree as to the value of the material compiled, they have been unable to lay before the conference a selection of verses bearing the stamp of their approval. They have suggested the names of experts in music whose engagement they recommended to take charge with full powers of editorial responsibility, which recommendation was for good reasons not concurred in.

Gratefully acknowledging the meritorious labors of former committees, your chairman ventures nevertheless to say that at the rate of progress that has been made in the past thirteen years, a satisfactory final edition of our hymnal would not be achieved in a human life-time. This assertion is made, not in derogation of the conscientious efforts of former committees, which no one appreciates more deeply than your chairman, but in order to call attention to the extraordinary difficulties of our problem. The task of preparing a new and original hymnal equal to the best is one that demands special aptitude and a rare combination of qualifications. But the problem, though difficult, much more difficult and urgent, in fact than the problem of a new Prayer Book, is by no means impossible of accomplishment—and within a fairly short time—by men possessing some literary, musical, and executive ability, and realizing the requirements of Jewish theology and the needs of Jewish congregations.

Under the financial limitations imposed upon them, previous committees at the best could not have made much headway. Two years ago the sum of \$500.00 was requested for the Hymnal Committee, and the matter was referred to the Executive Board with power to act. Last year a subvention of \$500.00 for the Hymnal Book Committee was granted unconditionally. An appropriation to the amount of \$500.00 is ridiculously inadequate for the consummation of the purpose in view. Our present book is a regrettable illustration of shoddiness that is an almost certain consequence of a niggardly policy of false economy. At every turn a conscientious Hymnal Committee will be hampered unless there is a liberal appropriation, large enough to cover the amount of all expenses that may be incurred.

Your chairman was fortunate in the men appointed to serve on his committee. Bros. Marx and Stern have had valuable experience as the chairmen of earlier committees, Bro. Marx' advice and active assistance having been particularly helpful to the writer of this report in every contingency. Bros. F. De Sola Mendes, Harris, and Ettelson are literary workers of

recognized ability, and their co-operation has been freely given. Bro. Singer has prosecuted the special tasks assigned him with vigor, enthusiasm and the intelligence of a trained musician.

The labor was so divided that each member of the committee bore his proportionate share of the burden. Many of the duties cheerfully assumed were real drudgery, and the hard-driven toilers would often have been justified in rebelling against the slave-driver methods that had to be used.

Thanks to the loyal and efficient assistance of his associates, your chairman has the satisfaction of being able to report to you that a new Union Hymnal is well in hand and is practically ready for publication.

In seeking suitable hymn-texts, your chairman has read critically about 3,000 hymns in various languages. He has examined the best productions of Jewish hymnology in English, German, and French. He has studied in the Hebrew and in translations a great number of Piutim. He has gone through the files of old Jewish periodicals. He has corresponded with Jewish writers of poetry soliciting verse from them. That no means that his judgment approved of might be left untried, he published a brief card in the Jewish press appealing for appropriate contributions of original poems. As a result of these measures your chairman obtained seven hundred hymn-texts by Jewish authors and a choice collection of two hundred suitable hymn-texts by Christian authors.

Of the seven hundred texts by Jewish authors your chairman selected one hundred and fifty which he submitted to his committee for critical examination. The final revision of your committee will reduce the material on hand, so it would seem, until, to estimate conservatively, about one hundred hymn-texts by Jewish authors will remain.

The Christian hymn-texts of universal character are not so numerous as those unacquainted with the subject imagine. Even the metrical paraphrases of psalms that have been written for Christian worship reflect the spirit of the New Testament rather than the spirit of the Hebrew lyrics from which they are derived.

Many excellent Christian hymns there are that can be made universal in character by expurgating the Trinitarian portions. "Nearer My God to Thee," "Lead Kindly Light" and Sir Thomas Olivers' "The God of Abraham Praise," are among the best known Christological hymns that have appeared, with the sectarian portions removed, in hymn-books intended for use in the Synagogue. Editors of Jewish Hymnals who have followed the plan of borrowing Christian hymns by eliminating from them the sectarian references have probably been of one mind with the Unitarian, who, when asked by an Episcopalian friend whether the Unitarian Service Book is not the same as the Episcopalian, only diluted, replied, "Oh, no; not diluted; *washed*."

A compilation consisting entirely, or chiefly of Christian hymns that are universal in character, or made so by expurgation, would give us a book

that would be Jewish only in the negative sense that it would contain nothing that is contrary to Judaism. For an adequate representation of specifically Jewish ideas we must depend upon writers whose habit of thought is distinctly Jewish. One of the weakest points of all our modern hymnals is the vagueness with which they reflect purely Jewish conceptions.

The demand is sometimes heard that no hymn-texts be used that are of non-Jewish authorship. The *Gesangbuch* of the Tempelgemeinde of Hamburg was prepared in accordance with this principle. It is worthy of note that the Jewish Religious Union of London gave offense to some people by printing in its Service Book a hymn, universal in character, but by a Christian author.

The one hundred and fifty hymns by Jewish writers which your chairman submits include hymns of praise, hymns of communion, hymns of fellowship, hymns of duty, marriage hymns, processional hymns, hymns of progress, hymns for the holy days, hymns for the dedication of a house of worship, besides others.

Unless contrary to the wishes of the conference, there will also be included in our book, hymns of Christian authorship, but universal in character, and that not because they have been made so by expurgation—a most reprehensible practice—but because they were originally so written.

Part II will contain Hebrew responses and hymns.

Part III will present a series of children's services.

An index of authors, composers, meters and first lines of hymns, and a cross-reference index of subjects will conclude the book.

The conditions imposed by regard for the approved practice of the best models of hymnology your chairman and his committee will faithfully observe.

If the musical settings that have been promised turn out to be of the same degree of excellence as the new hymn-texts that have been compiled, we shall have every reason, in the opinion of your chairman, to be satisfied with our book. About sixty hymns will require new musical settings. At a conservative estimate based upon prices asked by composers for original melodies, the sum of \$1,000 will be the minimum amount needed to acquire all of these sixty new settings.

Among the composers who have signified their willingness to write new music for us are the following: Frederick Cowen, of London; Isadore de Lara, of London and Paris; Carl Goldmark, of Vienna; Edward Samuel, of the Royal Conservatory of Music of Brussels; Henry L. Gideon, organist of Temple Israel, Boston; A. I. Epstein, organist of Temple Shaare Emeth, St. Louis; M. Henle, of the Reform Temple of Hamburg, Germany, and others of equal reputation.

There is one point that can not be emphasized too strongly. This Conference has neither the special knowledge nor the time to take up in de-

tail every question pertaining to the publication of our new Hymnal. Purely technical matters must be left to the discretion of your Committee. Unless a reasonable degree of confidence is felt in the competence of your committee, the completion of a new Hymn-Book will be indefinitely postponed.

Nothing but a critical study and a practical test of the book that will be submitted will answer conclusively the question of the fitness of your committee for the important work to which they have addressed themselves.

Your Committee recommends:

1. That a provisional edition of three hundred copies of our new book be printed without music.

2. That prominent composers who have expressed willingness to write original musical settings for us be invited to submit their manuscript to a commission of experts to be named by the executive committee. Wherever music already exists that the committee finds available for the texts collected, such music shall be used.

3. That composers whose music has been accepted be paid in accordance with a sliding scale of prices, no payment to be made for rejected compositions.

4. That the price for each composition or set of compositions be agreed upon between the composer and your committee and approved by the executive committee.

5. That a time be set aside at the next conference when the Union Hymnal and other matters pertaining to synagogal music be the special order of business.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRY H. MAYER,

Chairman.

And approved by

DAVID MARX,

H. W. ETTELSON,

JACOB SINGER,

Members of the committee present at the Conference.

On motion the report was received and taken up seriatim.

Recommendation I was read and its adoption moved. It was amended to print the text of the music together with the text of the words. It was further amended to refer the number of copies to be printed to the Executive Committee. A substitute was then offered to refer the entire matter to the Executive Committee. The substitute and the first amendment was defeated. The original motion, as modified by the second amendment prevailed *i. e.* the text of the words alone to be printed, the number of copies to be determined by the Executive Committee.

Recommendation II was carried. Recommendations III, IV and V were adopted and referred to the Executive Committee for execution.

It was moved and carried that the request of the Committee for an appropriation of \$1,000 be referred to the Finance Committee with instructions that it report favorably to the Executive Committee.

The report was then adopted as a whole as amended, with the thanks of the Conference.

Rabbi Leo M. Franklin, chairman, next presented the report of the Lyceum Bureau. The report was adopted, the matter of renewing the appropriation of \$50 being referred to the Executive Committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LYCEUM BUREAU.

To the Officers and members of the C. C. A. R.:

Your Committee on Lyceum Bureau begs leave to report that although the work entrusted to it has gone forward a little more slowly than we had hoped for, it has nonetheless progressed to a degree that is fairly gratifying. As we had occasion to say in a previous report to your honorable body, the influence exerted by our bureau is more frequently indirect than direct, and although we can point to several lecture courses that have been instituted directly as a result of the propaganda made by us, we can not take the credit for them all, inasmuch as negotiations begun by your Committee were concluded by the organizations concerned, without further reference to us. As a result, the statistical tables that might be appended to this report, as showing the actual number of lectures delivered under the auspices of our bureau, would be comparatively small, whereas the courses instituted through our influence are very much more numerous. That is to say, our work has been essentially inspirational. Perhaps this is as it should be inasmuch as it emphasizes more directly the individual effort of congregations, lodges and similar organizations, and gives them a sense of initiative which would be lacking if they were entirely dependent upon our efforts for carrying out the details of their lecture courses. It is gratifying to note nonetheless, that several courses were instituted and conducted directly by us this season. This was the case, for instance, at Niagara Falls, N. Y., and at Muncie, Ind. In the latter place lectures delivered being accompanied by a religious service on the Sabbath eve. In every instance the addresses given under our auspices have been essentially Jewish and have done much to awaken an interest in Jewish matters particularly in the smaller communities.

One of the efforts made by your committee has been to introduce courses of lectures on Jewish subjects, in college and university towns, where there are gathered together a considerable number of Jewish students. As a result, at the University of Illinois, a course has been planned for the coming season, the Ivrim Society of that institution taking charge of the details. The same is likely to be the case at the University of Michigan, where the Menorah Society recently organized promises to superintend the detailed arrangements. It is proposed during the coming year to push the work in university centers, as it is from among the young men and women now at college that we must expect to gain our Jewish leaders in the future. It is true, scattering efforts to interest university students in Jewish work have heretofore been made by other organizations, but as yet no very definite results can be shown. Despite the opinion frequently expressed in some quarters that the Jewish students at our universities do not wish to be identified as Jews, it is my experience that a great majority of them are not only willing but even eager to stand forth among their fellow students as self-respecting Jews and Jewesses, and that they feel a sense of humiliation when they are confronted by the fact that they alone are without a church home and without church affiliation in the college community. In several instances, to the shame of our Jewish congregations be it said, report has it that students of nearby universities are not even made welcome at the services on the high holy days. But happily this is not universally nor even generally true, and where colleges are located in larger cities the problem of meeting the students' needs is comparatively an easy one. This, however, is not the case where, as is usually true, the college or university is situated from thirty to fifty miles from a large congregation. One large congregation in a city adjacent to a college town has for some time had plans under consideration for organizing a branch student congregation from among the college community, and it is altogether likely that this plan will take definite shape before long. In the meantime, where such efforts are not being made, we find a desire on the part of Jewish students to assert their religious identity manifesting itself more and more in the organization of so-called "Jewish fraternities." This tendency, many of us believe, is an altogether deplorable one and one that ought to be discouraged and discountenanced. But it can be overcome only by the process of substitution, and your committee believes that by the establishment of lecture courses on Jewish subjects by competent Jewish authorities, the Jewishness of the students will be maintained and the nucleus of a properly constituted congregational organization will be furnished. In this matter, we plead again for a closer co-operation between our Conference and other Jewish organizations, like for instance the Synagogue and School Extension Department of the U. A. H. C., the Jewish Chautauqua and the Council of Jewish Women. These various organizations can be of tremendous benefit to the

cause if they will but work hand in hand in fostering our movement. Let it be said now and here that the Lyceum Bureau Committee seeks for no credit in the matter, but is perfectly willing to give any organization the full credit for the work which it does. But let the work be done.

Considerable correspondence has been carried on during the year between this committee and various non-Jewish organizations, and although lectures have been delivered to non-Jewish audiences only in the rarest instances, it is gratifying to note that a hearty interest in Jewish affairs seems to be manifest among a great many specifically Christian bodies, and judging from the correspondence now in hand, it is altogether likely that not less than a dozen courses of lectures on Jewish subjects will during the next season be instituted by Christian churches, Y. M. C. A.'s and other similar organizations. The value of thus spreading the message of Judaism to non-Jewish communities is easily apparent.

Year by year the Lyceum Bureau has been confronted by the fact that the personnel of the committee has not been named until late in the fall at a time after the various congregations, lodges and other organizations to whom their appeal is addressed, have laid their plans for their year's work. It is highly necessary if the work is to be carried on as efficiently as it should be, that this committee should be appointed practically at the first meeting of the new Executive Board, inasmuch as its circular letters should reach the various Jewish organizations at their very first meetings either immediately before or immediately following the high holy days in the early fall, and we request either that the new committee be appointed very early this year or that the present committee be authorized to initiate the work for the season and to carry it forward until their successors in office shall be named.

We find from actual experience that it would be wise to have representatives of this committee located in various sections of the country, and to that end we offer the suggestion either that members representing different sections of the country be appointed to this committee hereafter, or that the chairman of the committee be authorized to appoint assistants wherever he may deem such assistants necessary, giving them under his direction full charge of the work in their particular part of the country.

Your committee believes that the Lyceum Bureau, in conjunction with the committee on Social and Religious Union, should undertake the gathering of statistics in regard to communities where there are no organized congregations, to the end that we may know just where courses of lectures such as are delivered under our auspices might be of greatest benefit, and we ask for authority to undertake such an investigation, the necessary funds for it to be voted by this conference.

During the past year we have received from all sources the sum of \$64.00, which, together with the balance on hand September 1st, 1910, gave us a total income of \$77.50. Of this amount we have expended dur-

ing the year the sum of \$43.26, leaving on hand a balance of \$34.24. We ask that this sum, together with an appropriation of at least \$50.00 be made available for the further use of the committee.

Although the practical results of our work are as yet more or less limited, the members of this committee are highly optimistic as to its future possibilities, and we ask for the continued co-operation of our members.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

LEO M. FRANKLIN, Chairman.
SOL KORY,
SOL KORY,
E. MANNHEIMER,
S. G. BOTTIGHEIMER.

The report of the Committee on Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology was then presented by its chairman, Rabbi Samuel Schulman.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELABORATION OF A SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

In accordance with the resolution adopted by the Conference at Frankfort, the Committee on Theology was instructed to publish a volume of Theological Essays on subjects adopted by said resolution of the Conference. The committee feels that this is a very difficult task to perform merely by correspondence amongst its own members.

The committee, therefore, would like the Conference again to express its wish in the matter, and if the Conference, after due deliberation and discussion, should still feel the advisability of such a volume, the committee begs to submit that it ought to be reorganized; that it be made smaller, not exceeding five, and that members of such committee be so grouped that they can, without much inconvenience or expense, meet from time to time, if necessary. The committee feels that by the mere resolution passed at Frankfort, the nature and purpose of the committee have actually been changed. It has now become a publication committee.

A volume of first-class literary essays on various subjects would be a fine thing to achieve and worthy of the Conference, despite the fact that much has been done in the way of clarifying the essentials of Jewish theology since this resolution was passed. But if such a volume is ever to be

published, a smaller committee will have to be entrusted with the task of selecting writers and of supervising the work.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL SCHULMAN,
Chairman.
KAUFMAN KOHLER,
MAX LANDSBERG,
JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF,
WILLIAM ROSENAU,
ABRAHAM CRONBACH,
M. FRIEDLANDER,
DAVID NEUMARK,
MAX RAISIN,
MAURICE LEFKOVITS.

Committee.

Note.—Prof. Neumark, while favoring the report on the whole, does not favor limitation of membership of the committee to one section of the country and does not fear the matter of expense. And Rabbi Friedlander agrees with the spirit of the report, calling for a reorganization of the committee, but objects to the reduction in number and would have them scattered.

The report was adopted and the incoming Executive Committee was directed to re-organize this committee in accordance with its request, limiting its membership to five.

TUESDAY, JULY 4th, 1911.

The Convention was called to order with President Heller in the chair. Prayer was offered by Rabbi David Lefkowitz. In honor of the day the Convention joined in singing the National Hymn.

The Committee on Church and State reported as follows, through its chairman, Rabbi William S. Friedman:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.

To the President and Members of the C. C. A. R.:

Your Committee on Church and State beg leave to report as follows:

During the past year we have corresponded with Klaw and Erlanger; John Cort, president of the National Theater Owners' Association; Lee and J. J. Shubert, Martin Beck, manager of the Orpheum Circuit; Sullivan & Considine Theatrical Circuit, Alexander Pantages, president and manager of the Pantages Circuit of Vaudeville Theaters, and William Morris, President of the American Music Hall Company, writing the following letter to them:

Denver, Colorado, August 20, 1910.

Dear Sirs: I am addressing you as chairman of the Committee of Church and State of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, one of whose purposes is to prevent the lampoon of the Jew on the stage.

I do not believe that you would intentionally offend a large number of theater-goers. Will your love of fair play not prompt you to do what lies within your power to put an end to the contempt and insults to which the Jews are continually subjected?

Kindly let me know what action you will take, as I am anxious to report your answer to the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Very truly yours,

W. S. FRIEDMAN.

Satisfactory replies were received from the leading theatrical agencies in America.

Replies from Managers.

Dr. William S. Friedman, New York City, Aug. 24, 1910.

Rabbi, Congregational Emanuel, Denver, Colo.

My Dear Sir: Replying to yours of August 20, regarding the prevention of the lampooning of the Jew, as you say, on the stage, I think your position is well taken. While the Jew of the Warfield type educates and does not belittle Jewish character, I will do what I can, and take it up with the National Theater Owners' Association to put a stop to the low caricatures of your race. The vaudeville interests is where you suffer, and not in the legitimate.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CORT.

Dr. William S. Friedman, New York, August 24th, 1910.

1060 Emerson Street,

Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir: We have your letter of the 20th. We have never been in sympathy with the lampooning of the Jew, or of any other race or religion on the stage, and we think it in extremely bad taste to use the stage as a forum to exploit prejudice of any kind; and particularly against the Jews, who form so large a part of our best patrons. There is a big difference between showing the wit and humor of the Jew, as of any other character, and lampooning or bringing him into contempt and ridicule. You may depend upon our hearty co-operation.

Very truly yours,

KLAW & ERLANGER.

New York City, August 27, 1910.

My Dear Mr. Friedman: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 20th, and in reply would say that where we are concerned none of our attractions have any character in them which could possibly be construed as an unpleasant caricature of the Hebrew. I quite agree with you that all such are in worse than bad taste, and even if such performances

had no effect whatsoever on a large number of theater goers, we ourselves would be distinctly opposed to ridiculing our own race.

Thanking you for giving me an opportunity to express myself on this subject, I am,

Very truly yours,

J. J. SHUBERT.

Dr. Wm. S. Friedman,

1060 Emerson Avenue, Denver, Colo.

New York, August 25th, 1910.

Dr. Wm. S. Friedman, Chairman,

1060 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo.

Esteemed Sir: I have your valued favor of the 25th inst., and its contents are especially interesting to me, since I am thoroughly in accord with the sentiment expressed—with the object that inspired it—and with the results you hope ultimately to attain.

Both Mr. Meyerfield and myself now—and, in fact, have long entertained the belief that public caricaturing of the Hebrew in the theater is not only undignified, but that it is offensive to a large portion of our very best theater patrons. For several years we have tabooed this form of alleged humor in our houses, and, upon one occasion published an advertisement in all theatrical journals calling attention to this determination.

We congratulate you on the effort your committee is making, and assure you of every support within our power. As I have said, we have eliminated these objectionable features for years in the Orpheum houses, as much as was possible, and we are now using our influence with eastern managers to do likewise.

Believe me to be,

Very respectfully,

MARTIN BECK.

Seattle, Wash., Dec. 3d, 1910.

Mr. William S. Friedman,

1060 Emerson Street,

Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir: Your letter of November 29th received and contents noted. We have notified all our houses to eliminate everything objectionable to any race or denomination; that includes the Irish as well as the Jewish character, therefore, I would like for you people to also notify my different houses to do their utmost to eliminate all of the objectionable features.

Very truly,

ALEX. PANTAGES.

Seattle, U. S. A., Nov. 3d, 1910.

Mr. Wm. S. Friedman,

1060 Emerson Street, Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir: Your letter of October 31st just received. Note the contents

of the same. I am in hearty accord with you in this matter, and have instructed, on numerous occasions, all of our houses to cut out everything that would tend to degrade, not only the Jewish, but all other nationalities, and am pleased to report to you that there seems to be a tendency on the part of the actors themselves to improve in this respect.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. CONSIDINE.

New York, December 2d, 1910.

Mr. Wm. S. Friedman,

1060 Emerson Street,

Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir: In reply to your favor of the 29th we beg to advise you that William Morris, Inc., were one of the first ones to forbid any actor or actress on their stage to do anything that would lampoon or ridicule, not only the Jew, but any other nationality.

You may rest assured our services are at all times at your disposal for a request of this kind.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM MORRIS, INC.,

Edward L. Bloom.

Several of the theater managers and owners at once acted in accordance with their promises. It required much correspondence and was very difficult to induce others to live up to their agreement.

1. We recommend that the incoming Committee on Church and State be instructed to appoint one or more representatives in every State, who shall report to the Chairman of the Committee on Church and State any infringement in his territory of the principle of the separation of church and state, any ridicule of the Jew on the stage that may come to his notice, and any prejudiced statements in our public press, or on the forum or elsewhere.

Another important duty performed by your committee was the examination of various text books used in the public schools. It was found that many school song books contained many purely sectarian hymns. The one published by the Cable Company of Chicago contained an offensive song, "Soloman Levi," and a number of Christian hymns. Your committee entered into the following correspondence:

The Cable Company,

Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: As chairman of the Committee of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, one of whose objects is to protest against the ridicule of the Jew, I take the liberty of writing to you, feeling confident that your firm would not intentionally offend the Jews of this country.

My attention has been called to your "101 Best Songs." On pages 32 and 33 there is a song, "Solomon Levi," which is an insult to all American

citizens of Jewish faith. Can you not omit this song in future editions, and stop the further circulation of the book containing this song?

The hymns, "All Hail the Power of Jesus Name," page 31; "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," page 44; "Onward, Christian Soldiers," page 80; "Palm Branches," page 81, violate the recent decision of the Supreme Court of your State, June 29, 1910, prohibiting the Bible, religious hymns, etc., in the public schools. I am informed that your book is used in the public schools. For example, Marseilles, Ill.

Will you kindly let me hear from you and oblige,

Very truly yours,

WM. S. FRIEDMAN.

Denver, Colorado, July 14th, 1910.

Dr. Wm. S. Friedman,

Denver, Colo.

Dear Mr. Friedman: Your letter of protest reached this office this morning. It is a pleasure to be able to make this statement: That in no subsequent issue of ours will the song "Solomon Levi" appear.

The writer of this letter, who is also responsible for the publication of the book, merely recognized the song as one of the rollicking college songs of his youth, and did not read, as he should have done, the stanzas of this so-called song.

In another paragraph you make the statement, that "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," "Onward, Christian Soldiers," and "Palm Branches," are religious songs and are not allowable in the public schools of the State. Are there any other songs in the edition you speak of which, in your estimation, are equally a violation of the decision of the supreme court?

If, in a moment's leisure you will carefully go through the index, we should esteem it a favor to again hear from you regarding this matter.

Thanking you in advance for the kindness of your letter of protest, we remain,

Very truly yours,

THE CABLE COMPANY,

By R. J. Cook.

Chicago, Ill., July 16, 1910.

Your committee kept in constant touch with the constitutional conventions in New Mexico and Arizona, in order to guard against any infringement of the principle of the separation of church and state. We are happy to report that those constitutions, as framed preliminary to federal ratification, are in accord with the spirit of the conference on the subject of the elimination of all sectarianism.

At the last meeting of the Conference your committee was instructed to issue suitable accounts of our sacred days so that the public, through

the press, might be given correct information of our faith and its symbols. *Rash Hashona*, *Yom Kippur*, and *Succoth* were written up by Rabbi David Lefkowitz; *Chanuka* and *Purim*, by Rabbi Abram Simon, and *Pesach* and *Shabuoth* by Rabbi Martin A. Meyer.

The department of Synagogue and School Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations attended to the distribution of the accounts, mailing five copies of each, 14,000 copies in all, to 411 rabbis and 31 Jewish newspapers. Many of the rabbis reported that the newspapers were glad to print the accounts to the exclusion of others.

2. We recommend that similar accounts of our sacred days be published and distributed every year.

Obeysing the request to present, for the information of the Conference, excerpts from the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision of 1890, as well as from the Illinois Supreme Court decision of 1910, we submit the following:

STATE ex rel WEISS et al. vs. DISTRICT BOARD NO. 8 OF THE CITY
OF EDGERTON.

(Supreme Court of Wisconsin. March 18, 1890).

Common Schools—Bible Reading—Sectarian Instruction—Support of Religion.

1. In a petition for a writ of *mandamus* to compel the discontinuance of Bible Reading in the common schools, averments that petitioners are taxed for the support of the schools, and are equally entitled to the benefit thereof, and that the reading of the Bible therein is contrary to the rights of conscience, and is sectarian instruction, such as is prohibited by Const. Wis., Art. 10, Sec. 3, are sufficiently broad to cover every valid objection that may be made to such reading.

2. Averments in the answer to such petition that the reading of the Bible in the schools is not sectarian instruction, and that there is no material difference between the King James version used in the schools, and the Douay version, are not admitted by demurrer; the former being a conclusion of law, and the latter not well pleaded, being against common knowledge.

3. The "sectarian instruction" prohibited in the common schools by Const. Wis., Art. 10, Sec. 3, is instruction in the doctrines held by one or other of the various religious sects, and not by the rest; and hence, the reading of the Bible in such schools comes within this prohibition, since each sect with few exceptions, bases its peculiar doctrines, upon some portion of the Bible, the reading of which, tends to inculcate those doctrines.

4. The practice of reading the Bible in such schools can receive no sanction from the fact that pupils are not compelled to remain in the school

while it is being read; for the withdrawal of a portion of them at such time would tend to destroy the equality and uniformity of treatment of the pupils sought to be established and protected by the constitution.

5. The reading of the Bible is an act of worship, as that term is used in the constitution; and hence, the tax payers of any district who are compelled to contribute to the erection and support of common schools have the right to object to the reading of the Bible therein under Const. Wis. Art. 1, Sec. 18, Ch. 2, declaring that "no man shall be compelled to . . . erect or support any place of worship."

6. As the reading of the Bible at stated times in a common school is religious instruction, the money drawn from the state treasury for the support of such school is "for the benefit of a religious seminary," within the meaning of Const. Wis., Art. 1, Sec. 18, Ch. 4, prohibiting such appropriation of the funds of the State.

ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT DECISION.

Illinois Official Reporter, July 20, 1910.

The People ex rel, Jeremiah King et al, Plaintiffs in error.

The Board of Education of District 24, etc., Defendants in error.

Opinion filed June 29, 1910.

1. Constitutional Law. Free enjoyment of religious worship includes freedom not to worship. Sec. 2 of Art. 3 of the constitution guaranteeing "the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination," includes freedom from being compelled to join in any religious worship.

2. Same. Children attending public schools can not be compelled to join in religious worship. The reading of the Bible in the public schools, the singing of hymns and the repeating of the Lord's Prayer in concert, during which time the pupils are required to rise, bow their heads and fold their hands, constitutes worship within the meaning of the constitution, and pupils can not be compelled to join therein against their own or their parents' wishes.

3. Same. The constitution forbids giving sectarian instruction in public schools. The provision of Sec. 3 of Art. 8 of the constitution forbidding the use of public school funds in aid of any sectarian purpose is a prohibition of the giving of sectarian instruction in the public schools.

4. Same. Reading of the Bible in the public schools constitutes sectarian instruction. The reading of the Bible in the public schools constitutes the giving of sectarian instruction within the meaning of Sec. 3 of Art. 8 of the constitution.

A number of rabbis have recently succeeded in persuading school superintendents to substitute in the school curriculum one of the other plays of Shakespeare in place of the Merchant of Venice. Experience has con-

vinced us that the reading and discussion of the Merchant of Venice is often followed by humiliation and insult to Jewish children, and has a tendency to awaken prejudice and ill-will.

3. We recommend that the incoming Committee on Church and State, address to the University Committee, whose function it is to formulate English literature courses for high schools and grammar schools a reasoned request, the form of which is to be approved by the executive committee, that the study of Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice shall not figure in sub-college curricula.

4. We also recommend that the incoming committee on Church and State publish a calendar of our holidays, and send it to the presidents of the universities, and superintendents of the schools of our land, requesting that registration and examination days be set at times that do not conflict with our festivals.

5. Your committee again, as it did last year, urges that the tract committee, or the Committee on Church and State, proceed to publish a booklet on the subject, "This is Not a Christian Country."

The Executive Board asked your committee to formulate resolutions endorsing the decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois and we offer the following for adoption:

The principle of the separation of Church and State must remain inviolate, if the ideals of the founders of our American institutions are to be actualized. These were embodied in the constitution of the United States by those who knew the evils and had suffered from the restrictions of a State Church. The constitution is the crystallization of their ideal of the rights of conscience.

With deep concern has it been noted that religious fanaticism is endeavoring to thwart the purpose thus clearly outlined, and would use the public schools for the propagation of sectarianism. As a last resort the courts will be called upon to lead us back to the position of the fathers and founders of our government. It is a matter of great satisfaction that we have such trenchant and wise court decisions as in 1890 was handed down by the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and recently, in 1910, by the Supreme Court of Illinois.

Therefore, Be it Resolved, That the Central Conference of American Rabbis assembled in annual convention at St. Paul, Minnesota, record as American citizens, their high appreciation of the service towards the maintenance of the principle of the separation of Church and State, rendered by the Supreme Court of Illinois in its decision against the use of Bible readings in the public schools of that State.

Your Committee also recommends that the following resolution be agreed upon on the subject of the passport question:

Throughout its existence it has been the consistent policy of our government to protect its citizens by treaty rights in all countries where they

are temporarily residing or sojourning as visitors. Russia alone has persistently disregarded these rights of American citizenship. Some classes of American citizens enter Russia at their peril, even when in possession of a passport which bears the seal of the State Department.

Inasmuch as our government is based on the principle of equality before the law of all American citizens, any discrimination because of religious differences should not be countenanced.

Therefore, Be it Resolved, That the Central Conference of American Rabbis, assembled in convention at St. Paul, Minnesota, respectfully urge that the President and the Congress of the United States formally abrogate the treaty with Russia, unless Russia grant equal rights to all American citizens.

Further, That the President of this Conference and the Chairman of your Committee on Church and State be instructed to transmit the above resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of State, and to both Houses of Congress, through their respective presiding officers.

WILLIAM S. FRIEDMAN,
Chairman.

DAVID LEFKOWITZ.

Rabbi Friedman—I want to add that the Cable Company has omitted all the songs we objected to.

On motion the report was received with thanks and taken up seriatim.

Recommendation I was read.

Rabbi Philipson—Inasmuch as there may be some expense in carrying out this recommendation, it should go through the regular channel, namely, these appointments of representatives by the Committee on Church and State should be subject to the approval of the Executive Committee.

President Heller—If there are no objections it will be so understood.

Recommendation I as thus interpreted was adopted.

The second recommendation was read.

Rabbi Frisch—When that arrangement was first made it was contemplated to have, at least, two or three sets of these holiday write-ups for it was found difficult to have the afternoon papers accept the same write-up as the morning paper had.

Rabbi David Lefkowitz—I fully agree with the previous speaker. We have had accounts, not the very best, especially the first three sent out. From the point of view we may retain these for the

lesser papers, and the Committee on Church and State can prepare new accounts for the coming year.

Rabbi Klein—We are doing a lot of work for the needs of the smaller communities. I had occasion a short time ago to visit a certain congregation, the members of which deplored the fact they had the same difficulty there. There ought to be some way devised whereby any organization, through its secretary, could be supplied with the accounts for distribution in the smaller communities where there are no organized congregations.

Rabbi Schulman—I would suggest to the committee that whereas in the past we suffered from extreme frankness, to-day we may perhaps be suffering from too much dignity. The newspapers need a more vivid description of what a festival is than an average summary of the purpose and logic of the festival. I would make the suggestion that the writers take that into consideration.

President Heller—The Committee will take note of the various suggestions.

The recommendation was then put to a vote and adopted.

Recommendation III was then read.

Rabbi Lefkowitz—There is a University Committee which prescribes what books shall be read in the high schools; non-conformity with these requirements means that the certificates of graduation of these schools are not given recognition by the University Committee. It is that Committee to which we have reference.

Rabbi Deutsch—Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice has a standing in classical literature just as Goethe's Faust has, which is not free from anti-Jewish rallies; the former, in my opinion, is not as classic as the latter is; and it is because of this that this motion should not pass. . . . It is a matter of fact that Faust is one of the classic pieces of the oldest literature, and I do not propose either to expurgate or exclude Faust; neither would I do this with the Merchant of Venice.

Rabbi Schulman—I understand the force of the argument of the preceding speaker, but I do hope this resolution will pass. I would even amend it by adding the words "high school." There may be high schools not influenced by the University Committee. There is no analogy between Faust and the Merchant of Venice. We do not propose to eliminate a classical text-book because of some

scattered allusions. This is an entirely different case. . . . Sentiment is growing in our favor. The governing bodies are themselves ready to eliminate it. They feel the force of our objections. The matter is receiving attention in New York City. The authorities are in full sympathy with our attitude. It is not that we want to eliminate the Merchant of Venice from the studies of the university, but we do want to save our children from the humiliation and pain of sitting side by side with non-Jewish children and having this play so interpreted or rather misinterpreted. Although we know that Irving in his latter days, in his interpretation of Shylock, attempted to make a hero out of him, yet it remains a fact that in the consciousness of the English-speaking people Shylock is a synonym for Jew. If we are going to ask our theatrical managers to eliminate some types of the stage-Jew presented, a more effective and larger result would be reached by eliminating the Merchant from the curriculum of high schools.

(Rabbi Schulman in the Chair.)

Rabbi Heller—I should like to say a word on this question, just because it is a question on which I have reached a conclusion very slowly, very hesitatingly, and because it is a question that may attract more attention than anything else to come before this Convention. I am ready to admit that I was initially opposed to any such action as that recommended by the Committee. Here is a great classic, for the elimination of which from the schools, we are about to ask. This may appear to some people a piece of gigantic presumption. It may appear as if we were asking the American people and indirectly the English people in all the world to anathematize one of the most important plays, certainly one of the most vivid plays of Shakespeare. But while I came here opposed to any such declaration as being liable to misunderstanding, it seems to me the shape in which the committee has brought the question before us is an excellent one and should receive our hearty endorsement. We simply ask that it shall not form a part of the course in the high school and in elementary schools. We put ourselves in this position, that, without condemning Shakespeare, we claim this play is a dangerous one to submit to unripe minds. I wish to add only one word as to what Dr. Deutsch said and that is this: It is perfectly and most pathetically true that the liter-

atures of all the modern nations are poisoned with expressions of prejudice against the Jew, some of them incidental, and some of them coming in the very center and heart of the text. But such expressions as you find in Goethe's Faust, you will find scattered throughout Schiller, and you will find them scattered throughout many other classical and non-classical writings, and we certainly are not ready to ask for any such expurgations of the whole realm of literature. But as against this statement it must be acknowledged as a fact, there is no product whatsoever of any literature which is at one and the same time so highly classical by universal recognition, which stands so high in the esteem of the literary world, and which yet so emphatically and so powerfully centers around this one theme, bearing in contempt upon the Jew as the Merchant of Venice does. If, therefore, we single it out in this conservative, dignified, and quiet manner, being especially careful not to make our condemnation appear as a wholesale one, I for one, although I came here with my mind half made up against the recommendation, believe this step would do a great deal to eliminate occasions for prejudice, and for abuse, as I can testify from the experience of my own boys in the high school where they have had a taste for this species of suffering and I therefore, emphatically and unhesitatingly advocate that the recommendation of the committee be adopted.

The recommendation was adopted without dissent.

The fourth recommendation was then read.

Rabbi Gries—I amend to the effect that this work should be carried out through the Committee's State representatives who should see that the calendar goes to every superintendent of schools and to every college.

Rabbi Philipson—I would further amend to the effect that the committee on Church and State send a communication to all the members of this conference in ample time requesting them to personally see the superintendents of schools and the presidents of the colleges, wherever they can.

Rabbi Deutsch—I am very sorry to again oppose the popular side. I think you are taking a very dangerous step. First, you advocate the separation of church and state, particularly from the point of view of schools, and now you want the schools to be guided by Jewish precedents.

Rabbi Berkowitz—I would be in accord with the sentiment of the last speaker, if it were based upon practical experience. My experience however is quite the contrary. I receive the request from the principal of the high school in Philadelphia, to kindly let him know when the Jewish holidays occur. He desires to be courteous, and to recognize the conscience of his pupils. And a large percentage of the teachers in the public schools and high schools regard it as important to take cognizance of these days. It depends altogether upon the spirit in which you go about it. If you come demanding it, as Dr. Deutsch suggests, then he is justified in his position. But if we come in a courteous spirit, it is entirely different. We have heard a great deal all through the report how much the spirit of the American people is with us in recognizing these conscientious scruples, and it is only in that spirit that we should go to the schools with this proposition.

Rabbi Morgenstern—We are not taking a sufficiently large practical aspect of this matter. The plan before us at present merely has in view those communities in which our members are residing, or with which they can come in immediate contact. Ways and means should be devised by which this committee can reach every school superintendent and every college throughout the country. It should be feasible through the Superintendent of Education in every State to get a list of the superintendents of schools and colleges within his State. After we have that it is a mere clerical matter to send out to all the school superintendents and college presidents from year to year circulars giving them the necessary information. In addition to this our members could, of course, add the weight of their personal influence, in making a determined effort to reach every school superintendent and every college president in the country.

Dr. Philipson—I do not agree with the position of Dr. Deutsch altogether, but I sympathize with what he says in some ways, and especially after hearing the last speaker. I believe it is extremely dangerous for the Central Conference of American Rabbis to address communications officially to the various school superintendents and the various presidents of colleges and universities. It is a different thing for individuals to make the request. We ought to be extremely careful.

The recommendation was adopted as amended. Rabbis Deutsch and Foster desired their votes recorded in the negative.

The fifth recommendation was read and on motion referred to the Executive Committee.

The resolution of the committee endorsing the decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois, with reference to the reading of the Bible in the public schools, together with the preamble, was adopted by a unanimous vote.

The resolution prepared by the Committee with reference to the Russian Passport Question was then re-read.

Rabbi Stolz—I think in this matter we have overlooked something of tremendous importance. In this resolution we ask the president of the United States and others to do all in their power to correct this situation. Now, that is what the Jews of the United States have been doing for the last thirty years, and always the answer is the same, "We would like to very much." They promise it before election, they put it in their platforms, and when the time comes to do something, they say they are very sorry, and can not do anything. Now, the matter has come to an issue before the people of the United States. It is time to do something, and that is that we demand that this treaty be abrogated.

The resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote.

The report was then adopted as a whole and the thanks of the Conference extended the Committee for its excellent work.

Rabbi Heller in the Chair.

President Heller—The next order of business is the program of Religious Education Day. To-day is dedicated to Religious Education. In accordance with our time-honored custom, the chairman of the Committee on Religious Education will be called upon to preside.

Rabbi Gries in the Chair.

The Religious Education Committee, Rabbi Moses J. Gries, chairman, presented its report, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Religious Education has labored under many diffi-

culties and disadvantages during the past year, namely: the delay in the appointment of the committee, the very late publication of the year book containing the reports and actions and instructions of the last Conference, and also the failure of many of the members of the committee to make any response or to offer the slightest help. Were it not for the faithful few, the chairman would have been compelled to bear the entire burden and to do all the work.

An effort was made to take a "Census" of the schools under the direction of the members of the Conference. Of 195 members addressed, only 63 responded. The report is necessarily incomplete, but is herewith submitted. An analysis indicates that our schools do not begin to do their full duty. The many congregations reporting no children of non-members, or only a few, explains the smallness of our religious schools, compared with the strength and number of the membership of our congregations, and furnishes one reason for the thousands of children, especially in our large cities, not now receiving regular religious instruction. Our Jewish congregations continue to maintain a wrong attitude toward the children of non-members. They do not seem to be moved by an enthusiastic zeal or by a missionary spirit, to carry Jewish instruction to every child in the community. It is important that we awake to a realization of our obligations, and that we instruct, train and hold the children who are to be the men and women of the next generation.

The most important question before the Religious Education Committee has been the promotion of a Correspondence School for Teachers. The project has been under discussion for the past few years and a number of organizations have had this subject under consideration. The Synagogue and School Extension Board, through Rabbi Zepin, report that they have undertaken so many new enterprises that they could not finance a correspondence school. The Teachers' Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary, through Dr. Kaplan, report that at the present time it would be impossible for the Institute to launch out on any such work, and that all its resources must be otherwise employed at present. The Teachers' College associated with the Hebrew Union College, through Dr. Grossman, report an intention to take up this work, but in reply to repeated specific inquiries no definite answer as concerns plans or program could be secured. The Jewish Chautauqua, through its Chancellor, Dr. Berkowitz, declares that the work has been in preparation for some time, and that the Chautauqua is ready to accept this responsibility, if it will receive proper encouragement and support. I have asked Dr. Berkowitz, as part of the Religious Education Day program, to outline for your consideration and discussion, the proposed correspondence school.

The resources of the Conference are greatly taxed, and its officers, especially its secretaries, are burdened with many responsibilities in the conduct of the business of the Conference. It does not seem possible that

the Conference could establish and conduct a correspondence school without establishing an office and officer, whose life and service would be more continuous and permanent than is now customary with our Conference Committees. The work seems to lie within the province of the Jewish Chautauqua, and it seems to be best equipped to assume the obligation.

Be it therefore resolved that the Conference urge the Jewish Chautauqua to establish a Correspondence School for Teachers, and that the Rabbis be requested to give the Chautauqua Society encouragement, co-operation, and both moral and financial support.

Be it further resolved that the work of the Jewish Religious School Census be completed during the coming year.

Be it further resolved that the Religious Education Committee be given further time for the publication of the descriptive catalogue of the Religious Education Exhibit, and the Teachers' Reference Library and the Jewish Childrens' Library.

The Committee, in a general letter addressed to the members of the Conference, invited suggestions from all, both as to the future work of the Committee and with regard to the future program for Religious Education Day. The Committee regrets to be compelled to report that not a single suggestion was received in response to the general invitation. We, as Rabbis, continually ask loyalty, enthusiasm and service from the people; we, ourselves, should set the example by the enthusiasm, loyalty and service which we give in earnest co-operation to the cause in which we believe.

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES, *Chairman*,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
LEO M. FRANKLIN,
JOSEPH STOLZ,
JOS. H. KORNFELD,
HENRY BERKOWITZ.

At the request of Chairman Gries, action on the resolution contained in the report with reference to the Correspondence School was deferred until after Rabbi Berkowitz had presented his outline of the proposed school. The resolutions regarding the completion of the census and the publication of the Descriptive Catalogue were adopted unanimously.

Rabbi David Philipson then read his paper on "The Harvest Service," (Appendix F).

This paper was discussed by Rabbis Marcuson, Heller, Schulman, Berkowitz, Stolz, Deinard, Levi, Fox and Morgenstern. On mo-

tion the paper was ordered printed in the Year Book with a footnote stating that Rabbi Philipson would furnish copies of his Harvest Service to all who so desired.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

Rabbi Henry Berkowitz made a statement on the subject: "A Correspondence School for Jewish Teachers" (Appendix G).

Following Rabbi Berkowitz's statement, the resolution of the Religious Education Committee anent the Correspondence School was put to a vote and unanimously carried.

A paper on "The Problem of Ethical Instruction in the Public School," by Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber was, in the absence of the author, who had been called back to his home, read by Rabbi George Zepin. (Appendix H¹).

On motion the recommendations at the end of the paper were referred to a special committee for deliberate consideration and re-formulation, the report of this committee to be presented the next day.

Rabbi Martin Zielonka led the discussion of the paper (Appendix H²).

The Conference passed a vote of thanks to Rabbis Schanfarber and Zielonka.

Rabbi Gries then read the report of the Religious Education Exhibit. The report was adopted as read.

REPORT CONCERNING THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION EXHIBIT.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on the Religious Education Exhibit beg leave to report that the Conference is indebted to the Bloch Publishing Co. for their generous gift of the books and material published by them; to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations for a set of their leaflets; and to the Jewish Chautauqua for a full set of their publications. The Jewish Publication Society were twice requested to give a full set of their books and pamphlets to the permanent Exhibit. No reply has, as yet, been received.

The Exhibit this year contains a series of lists of Childrens' books and Childrens' Libraries prepared for the public schools and recommended by library and school experts.

Special attention is called to the exhibit of the Religious Education Association, of books dealing with the problem of ethical instruction in schools, the discussion of which theme forms a part of our program. Also to the collection of text-books and pamphlets prepared by the Sunday-school Commissions of various non-Jewish Organizations.

An effort was made to have a special exhibit of the work of our religious schools, their methods and their distinctive books and material. It is with regret that I report that but three schools have responded to this invitation, namely, Rabbi Frisch of Pine Bluff, Ark., and Rabbi Gries of the Temple, Cleveland and Rabbi Stolz of Chicago. It is to be deplored that there is not more enthusiasm for helpfulness to others.

The Conference Exhibit was loaned to the Jewish Religious Education Association of Ohio for its meeting in Dayton in December, 1910; was requested by the Arkansas Jewish Sabbath-school Teachers' Association but could not be forwarded in time; and was likewise loaned to the Religious Education Association which convened in February in Providence, R. I.

Be it resolved that the Committee in the name of the Conference be authorized to give formal expression of thanks to those who have so generously co-operated toward the success of the Exhibit.

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES, *Chairman*,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

LEO M. FRANKLIN,

JOS. S. KORNFELD,

DAVID PHILIPSON,

HENRY BERKOWITZ,

A paper entitled, "Sabbath-school Work for High School Pupils," was then read by Rabbi Leo M. Franklin (Appendix I). Rabbis Stolz, Marx, Gries and Berkowitz participated in the discussion that followed.

On motion the Committee on Religious Education was directed to outline a plan of instruction for adolescents along the lines set forth in Rabbi Franklin's paper, the same to be submitted at the next Conference.

The report of the Text-Book Commission was read by the chairman, Rabbi Gries. The recommendation of thanks contained therein was adopted at once, while the remainder of the report was referred to the Committee on President's Message.

REPORT OF THE TEXT-BOOK COMMISSION.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Text-book Commission was appointed very late in the year. All the members named for the Commission accepted the appointment, but very few have offered any suggestion as to the proposed plan of work.

The thanks of the Conference are due to the officers of a group of non-Jewish Organizations for their courtesy to your Commission, for information as to their own past experience freely given, and for their expressed desire and willingness to help in any possible way.

Be it therefore resolved that the Commission be authorized to express to them, the thanks of the Conference.

Books and pamphlets published by these organizations form a part of the Religious Education Exhibit.

It has been the plan of your Committee to endeavor to learn what have been the organization and methods of the Educational Commissions established by other religious bodies, in order to prepare and present to the Conference a plan for future procedure.

An inquiry concerning text-books now in use reveals a remarkable lack of uniformity. The responses contained a general expression of the inadequacy and unsatisfactory character of our present text-books and available material. The need is urgent for Jewish Religious School-books attractive in form and content, and prepared according to modern educational methods.

Various Jewish Organizations are now announcing their intention to publish Jewish text-books. It would be for the good of all, if this newborn zeal might be wisely directed, and these various organizations and institutions brought into some harmonious and successful co-operation.

Be it resolved, that the Central Conference of American Rabbis hereby declare its willingness and eagerness to co-operate with the organizations and institutions interested in the publication of Jewish text books and in the development of Religious Education.

Your Committee, acting upon the recommendation of the President of the Conference, and under the instruction of the Conference which declared that the time has come for the Conference to widen its sphere of active work by preparing and publishing text-books for our religious schools, planned to submit to this Conference a method for procedure.

Your Committee, however, welcome the official communication, through Mr. Walter Freiberg, president of the Union of American-Hebrew Congregations, and through Rabbi Zepin, Director of the Synagogue, School Extension Board, of the general plan and programme of the Union with reference to the publication of Jewish text-books, and of the organization of a Board of Editors, giving ex-officio representation to the Central Conference of American Rabbis, through its president, and the Chairman of its

Religious Education Committee, and to the Jewish Chautauqua Society, through its Chancellor.

Be it resolved, that the Central Conference of American Rabbis express its hearty approval of the proposed project of the Union, urge the need for its prompt and efficient execution, and offer the earnest co-operation of the Conference towards its successful fulfilment.

Be it resolved, that the sentiment here expressed, and the resolution of the Conference be officially conveyed to the President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID PHILIPSON,

LEO M. FRANKLIN,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

JOS. S. KORNFELD,

A round table on the "Interesting Features of the Year's Work" was then held in which Rabbis Gries, Heller, Stolz and Rypins took part. The Convention then adjourned until the next day.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JULY 5.

The Convention was called to order by President Heller. Prayer was offered by Rabbi George Fox.

The report of the Committee on Sermonic Literature was presented by its chairman, Rabbi Samuel Hirschberg and on motion the recommendation contained therein was referred to the Executive Committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SERMONIC LITERATURE.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Committee on Sermonic Literature through its Chairman, begs leave to report that it compiled in season for the last high holidays its usual set of sermons for these occasions. The pamphlet, according to your action taken at Charlevoix, was distributed through the agency of the Department of Synagog Extension of the U. A. H. C., and reached a far wider and more numerous clientele, and thus was enabled to serve its purpose much more efficiently and successfully, than in previous years. The Committee would herewith tender its grateful acknowledgment to the Department of Synagog Extension, and especially, to its able Director, Rabbi George Zepin, for their splendid services in distributing the pamphlet.

The Chairman, at this writing, has no means of ascertaining the number of past issues of the Holiday pamphlet that may be on hand at Bloch & Co. or elsewhere. But if there be a sufficient number to supply the needs of

small communities or of single families or individuals in the rural districts, who are—as he understands it—the especial concern of the Conference in this matter, he would recommend that these be used for distribution purposes this year, and no new pamphlet be published.

If however, it be the will of the Conference that such a new pamphlet be published, he desires to advise his successor and the successors of his associates on the Committee that four sermons have been received, with the two others necessary to complete such a pamphlet, promised and likely to be shortly forthcoming.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL HIRSHBERG, *Chairman.*

The report of the Committee on Minister's Handbook was read by the Secretary. Since no member of the Committee was present, the report was referred to the Executive Committee to make such disposition of it as it deemed most useful, but, in any event, to have the matter presented for final action at the next Conference.

The report of the Committee on Tracts, Rabbi Max. Heller chairman, was next presented and on motion adopted.

REPORT OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

To the Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

COLLEAGUES: Your Committee on Tracts reports again that no tract has been published during the past year. Various subjects and articles were under consideration, but no conclusion was reached on any one of them. The demand for tract number one has exhausted the supply and calls for republication. Your committee recommends to the executive committee the printing of another edition of this tract. We have as yet been unable to enter upon the propaganda in the Yiddish language which has been favored by the Conference. The committee endorses the recommendation of your Solicitation Committee as to the printing of an explanation of object and appeal for contribution, to accompany each one of our forthcoming tracts. The committee asks that the tract fund collected by the persevering labors of our Solicitation Committee be placed at its disposal and hopes that under the direction of the Executive Committee, with larger means, the good work of tract propaganda may become a regular feature of our annual activities, expanding rapidly in efficiency and service.

MAX HELLER, *Chairman,*

LEO M. FRANKEL,

JOSEPH STOLZ,

DAVID PHILIPSON.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PERSONAL PRAYERS.

Rabbi Henry Berkowitz, chairman, then presented the report of the Committee on Personal Prayers.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: The compilation of Prayers for the use of individuals and families in private devotion, heretofore presented and referred back to the Committee by the Conference of 1910, is herewith submitted in its completed form. The work has received searching analysis and revision since our last session. Some forty members submitted their suggestions and emendations. All of these accorded general and hearty approval of the Committee's work.

Under the title: "Prayers for Private Devotion from the Union Prayer Book," we offer this collection as a substitute for the section including pages 286-294 in the Union Prayer Book. The Committee has been at pains to keep this section in as complete conformity as possible with the Union Prayer Book throughout, both in content and spirit, aiming to maintain complete consistency in all parts of our prayer book as to style of publication, translation from the Hebrew, use of formularies, such as Benedictions and the like. The Leeser translations and Dr. Kohler's version have been given preference wherever in the Biblical selections the variants have demanded a selection.

Some of the criticisms received made reference to the omission of certain Prayers. In each instance the omission was intentional in order to keep a clearly defined line of demarcation between Prayers for Private Devotion and those which belong to the projected Ministers Hand-book.

Some members criticized the repetition of several Psalms unmindful of the fact that the Prayers in this collection are for distinct occasions in life and not for such continuous and repeated use as those contained in the other parts of the Union Prayer Book.

We feel that inasmuch as every suggestion received has been carefully considered and acted upon, our work is now completed and we respectfully ask to be discharged.

HENRY BERKOWITZ, *Chairman,*

ISAAC LANDMAN,

C. A. RUBENSTEIN,

MARCUS SALZMAN,

ELI MAYER, *Secretary.*

On motion the report was adopted and a time limit, October 1, 1911, set for the members of the Conference to propose further corrections and suggestions to the Committee. The Committee was instructed to report to the Executive Committee at its meeting in Cincinnati in October, after which it was authorized to proceed with the printing of the book and the preparation of plates. The Committee was further instructed to omit the words **ואהבת לרעך כמוך** in their particular connection on pages 8 and 10 of the manuscript.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

After an automobile ride about Minneapolis and the vicinity as the guests of the Minneapolis community, the Conference reassembled at four o'clock in the auditorium of the Temple at Minneapolis. A paper on Jewish Apologetics was read by Rabbi Max C. Currick (Appendix J).

The report of the Committee on Dependents, Defectives and Delinquents was presented by its chairman, Rabbi Joseph Kornfeld.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEPENDENTS, DEFECTIVES
AND DELINQUENTS.*To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:*

Your Committee on Dependents, Defectives and Delinquents begs leave to submit the following report. Notwithstanding the lateness of the publication of the Year Book, the recommendations of this Committee in the last year's report have been, in the main, carried out. Those recommendations dealing exclusively with the delinquents, your committee has devoted itself chiefly to this phase of its work.

Pursuant to the instructions of the Executive Committee, your chairman wrote to the secretary of the National Conference of Jewish charities, concerning the rehabilitation of the delinquent after his discharge from prison. He pointed out that at the present time the attitude of our associated charities is not sufficiently sympathetic to the discharged prisoner, and advised that when destitute, at least, first aid should be given him, so that his lapse into a criminal career may not be rendered well nigh certain. In response to this communication, your chairman was assured that this matter would be presented to the superintendents of charities in attendance at the Conference.

Your Chairman has also had a conference with several of the leaders of District No. 6, I. O. B. B., on the advisability of appointing official visitors similar to those of District No. 2, and he received the assurance that this matter will be taken up at the convention of the District this month.

It is also very gratifying to report that all the members of our Conference, and the Rabbis not members of this body, have cheerfully given their time to the religious care of our co-religionists who have strayed from the path of virtue and rectitude. Nevertheless, despite the laudable individual efforts in this worthy cause, we feel that the work, as done at present, is too fragmentary, and, therefore, is inadequate as a solution of this problem,—one of the gravest with which society has to deal. The

official duties of the American rabbi are altogether too numerous to allow him to give enough time, even though he may give his best thought to this subject. The creation of official visitors by the B'nai B'rith is a decided advance, because, the expense of doing this work being borne by the district, each official visitor is required to present an annual report, thereby introducing some measure of organization into this work. But even this remedy is only tentative, and should be regarded simply as a step in the right direction. The desideratum will not be realized until the work will be done by a social worker who will devote all his time and thought to this phase of the social service. Until this is attained, a great deal of propaganda work will have to be done by this body.

Your Committee, therefore, begs to submit the following recommendations:

1. That the President of the Conference address a communication to the other districts of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, requesting them to emulate the splendid example of District No. 2.

2. That the holiday notices sent out through the agency of the Department of Synagog and School Extension be also sent to the wardens of the penal and reformatory institutions, and, if possible, to the superintendents of institutions for defectives and dependents.

3. That a census of the Jewish delinquents throughout the country be taken by the Synagog and School Extension. The purpose of this is twofold. In the first place, it will serve as a refutation of the gross exaggerations that appear from time to time in the press, as to Jewish delinquency; secondly, and what is far more important, it will convince American Jewry of the gravity of the problem of criminality among Jews, and stimulate them to do everything that will tend towards its reduction. Inasmuch as this can best be done by the Department of Synagog and School Extension, we request them to undertake this work.

4. That the conference undertake a more thorough investigation of the causes of criminality, and that at some future time a paper on this subject be presented before this conference. Regardless of delinquency among Jews, the synagog can not afford to be behind the church in the solution of this problem. Our religion regards society as an organism, and, therefore, stands on strictly scientific grounds relative to this matter, and is best qualified to give such a solution.

In conclusion, the Committee would express its grateful acknowledgment of the services rendered by all those who unselfishly gave themselves to uplift the Jewish dependents, defectives and delinquents during the past year. We would also thank the Union of American Hebrew Congregations for supplying their religious leaflets, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis for furnishing prayer books without charge to the inmates of institutions.

Respectfully submitted,
JOSEPH KORNFELD.

Upon motion the report was taken up seriatim.

Recommendation I was read. Moved and carried that the Conference communicate through its executive officers with the Grand President of the Independent Order of the B'nai B'rith, requesting that each district of the order undertake the work outlined in the recommendation. Rabbi C. S. Levi wished his vote recorded in the negative.

Recommendation II was adopted.

Recommendation III was read. Moved and carried that the executive officers communicate with the Bureau of Synagog and School Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations requesting it to undertake this work.

Recommendation IV was on motion referred to the Executive Committee.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

The Committee on Civil and Religious Marriage Laws, through its chairman, Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, reported progress.

The report of the Committee on Summer Services was presented by its chairman, Rabbi Zepin, and on motion adopted.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SUMMER CONGREGATIONS.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

In conformity with the action of last year's Conference, your Committee on Summer Congregations co-operated with the Department of Synagog and School Extension, in the work of popularizing the practice of holding services at summer resorts.

In Michigan, four temporary congregations were established, at Oden, Petoskey, Charlevoix and Ottawa Beach. Six ministers and one layman volunteered their services at these four places. They were Rabbi Solomon L. Kory of Vicksburg; Rabbi David Lefkowitz, of Dayton; Rabbi M. Newfield, of Birmingham; Rabbi Leo M. Franklin, of Detroit; Rabbi Isaac Landman, of Philadelphia; Rabbi Israel Klein, of Chicago, and the layman was Mr. Samuel Ullman, of Birmingham.

A general request was issued to the ministry, to furnish the committee with data concerning services held by them during the summer at various watering places. This request was responded to by Dr. Joseph Stolz, of Chicago, summering at Gull Lake, Mich.; by Dr. Henry Englander, of Cincinnati, Dr. Henry Stern of Providence, and Rabbi M. Feuerlicht of Indianapolis, all at Shawamet Beach, R. I.; by Dr. A. Guttman, of Syracuse, N.

Y., at Star Lake, N. Y.; by Rabbi George Fox of Ft. Worth, Tex., at Frankfort, Mich.; by Rabbi B. C. Ehrenreich of Montgomery, Ala.; Rabbi George Solomon of Savannah, and Rabbi David Marx of Atlanta, Ga., who conducted services during the summer at Kennebunkport, Me., and by Mr. Morris S. Lazon, a student of the College, who conducted services at Asheville, N. C.

Altogether about sixty services were held by fifteen ministers, and two laymen. Accounts of the services were published in the Jewish press.

The committee respectfully suggests that the same general plans be pursued for the ensuing season.

The committee also urges upon the attention of the members of the C. C. A. R. the desirability of proper publicity in this work. There are many laymen who hesitate to connect themselves with such movements, fearing to become religiously conspicuous. These weak brothers will have their fears allayed by the knowledge that Jews in all parts of the country are acting in a similar manner. The Department of Synagog & School Extension will give publicity to all communications of this sort.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE ZEPIN, *Chairman*,

S. HECHT,

SIMON R. COHEN.

Moved and carried that an official communication expressing the thanks of the Conference to the Bureau of Synagog and School Extension for all assistance rendered the Conference in its various activities, be sent to the Board of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

The report of the Committee on Week-day Service, Rabbi H. G. Enelow, chairman, was received and on motion the request contained therein was granted.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WEEK-DAY SERVICE.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Committee on Morning Services for Week-days begs to submit the following report:

The members of the Conference have been requested to examine the copy of the booklet mailed to them some time ago, and to communicate their views about it, with suggestions for improvement, to the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee has heard from only five members. Several congregations have been using the book at their Sunday services. The committee asks that further time be allowed it by the Conference for obtaining suggestions from such congregations as to revi-

sions and improvements they would propose on the basis of their experience.

Respectfully submitted,
H. G. ENELow, *Chairman*,
LEO. M. FRANKLIN,
MOSES J. GRIES.

The report of the Committee on Synagog and Labor, Rabbi Foster chairman, was presented and on motion received and taken up seriatim.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SYNAGOG AND LABOR.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Synagog and Labor, in submitting its first report to the conference, begs leave to call attention to the fact that its duties have in no way been defined. The committee therefore has felt some hesitancy in grappling with a problem so momentous and comprehensive as that implied in its very name, without definite instructions from the Conference as to the limitations of its endeavors. The difficulty under which the committee labored was all the more magnified by the lateness of the appointment of the committee.

The committee after careful deliberation recommends to the Conference the adoption of the following plan and basis for its work:

- I. Secure a record of the activity of the members of the C. C. A. R. in behalf of the Jewish laborer and in the cause of industrial reform.
- II. Compile a report of industrial reforms already adopted or proposed by Jewish employers of labor in all lines of industry.
- III. Collect data as a record of the achievements of Jews as leaders of theory and practice in industrial reform.
- IV. Compile a select list of articles, sermons, essays, and other literary productions, that reflect the moral aspect of the industrial conflict.
- V. Investigate the subject of Synagog Administration covering membership, dues and assessments, to ascertain to what extent present methods affect the membership of the laborer in the Synagogue.
- VI. The Executive Committee be instructed to select a Sabbath in the year, in which all members of the Conference be requested to preach to their respective congregations on the moral effects of labor.
- VII. The committee shall be authorized, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, to publish a brief bulletin of its study in the field of industry for circulation among members of the Conference.

SOLOMON FOSTER, *Chairman*,
ELI MAYER,
S. N. DEINARD.

Recommendation I was adopted.

Recommendations II and II and IV were referred to the Executive Committee.

Recommendation V was adopted.

Recommendation VI was adopted and the Executive Committee instructed to carry out its provisions.

Recommendation VII was referred to the Executive Committee.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

(Minneapolis).

After enjoying a banquet at the Commercial Club as the guests of the Minneapolis community, the Conference reassembled.

A paper on Leopold Stein, commemorating the centenary of his birth, was read by Rabbi Harry W. Ettelson (Appendix K).

The following round tables, discussing three helpful books of the year, were then presented:

Drews' "The Christ Myth," Rabbi S. N. Deinard, leader.

Jane Addams' "Twenty Years at Hull House," Rabbi Eugene Mannheimer, leader.

Eschelbacher's "Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums," Rabbi Joseph Rauch, leader.

Adjourned.

THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 6, 1911.

(St. Paul).

The Convention was called to order by President Heller. Prayer was offered by Rabbi Herman Rosenwasser.

The Committee on Co-operation in Emergency, Rabbi Max Heller, chairman, presented the following report, which, on motion, was referred to the Committee on President's Message.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATION IN EMERGENCY.

To the Officers and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Executive Committee at its meeting on January 16 at the time of the Council of American Hebrew Congregations created a standing committee which was at once to enter into negotiation with the Union of

American Hebrew Congregations, the Order of Bnai Brith and the American Jewish Committee for the purpose of arranging with these bodies some *modus operandi* by which representatives of our Conference would act uniformly with the other bodies whenever, under some important emergency, a plea was to be made or joint action taken on behalf of endangered Jewish rights.

Since then the prerogative of your Executive Committee to appoint standing committees has been called in question; it has been impossible to bring about a meeting of the committee and it seemed impracticable to arrange so responsible a matter by correspondence. There are principles and practical considerations involved which render it advisable to have action in the matter emanate from the Conference in convention assembled. The matter seems of importance sufficient, as a question of statesmanship, to call for clear and authoritative instructions from our members.

MAX. HELLER, *Chairman*,
S. SCHULMAN,
MOSES J. GRIES,
DAVID PHILIPSON.

The report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions, Rabbi G. Deutsch chairman, was then presented.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in annual convention assembled at St. Paul, Minnesota, hereby records its great sorrow at the death on November 16th, 1910, with such startling and tragic suddenness of its honored colleague and co-worker, and eminent teacher in Israel, *Ephraim Feldman*. For over a quarter of a century his brilliant gifts of mind and heart were given to the education of those who were to become the moral and spiritual teachers of the American Jewish people. We extend our sincere sympathy to the bereaved wife and sorrowing children, assuring them that while they mourn the loss of a devoted husband and father, we grieve over an untimely taking away of our beloved associate and friend. May they be consoled with the thought that the life of their beloved dear one has exemplified the words of scripture: "They that are wise shall shine with the brightness of the firmament; and they that lead many to righteousness, as the stars, forever and ever."

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in annual session assembled, having learned that *Dr. Israel Lewy*, professor of Talmud in the Rabbinical Seminary of Breslau has, on January 7th, 1911, passed the three-score and ten years of his useful life, hereby extends to him its most heartfelt felicitations. The Conference records its sense of gratitude for and appreciation of the valuable services rendered by Professor Lewy, towards a systematic and intelligent exposition of the profound lore embodied in the Talmud.

Resolved, That a copy of this expression of felicitation and appreciation be forwarded to Professor Lewy.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in annual session assembled, expresses its profound sorrow at the demise of *Hirsch Hildesheimer*, on December 6th, 1910 in the city of Berlin. Hirsch Hildesheimer was a scholar, publicist and communal worker of no mean merit. He was an ever-ready champion by word and deed, of Jew and Judaism. Though his religious convictions were, in many respects, not our own, we deplore in his death the loss of a sincere and courageous spokesman, whose voice and pen were at all times at the service of Israel's cause.

Resolved, That the Conference deeply sympathizes with the grief-stricken widow, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Rabbiner-seminar of Berlin, of whose teaching staff the deceased was a member.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in annual convention assembled, in St. Paul, Minnesota, having learned since its last convocation of the two-fold sorrow that has come to the venerable head of the British Synagogue, the very Reverend Chief Rabbi, Dr. Herman Adler of London, England, in the loss of his son, his only one, S. Alfred Adler, and subsequently of his brother, Marcus Adler, wishes to give expression to its sincere sympathy for this aged servant of the Lord, praying that in the performance of the high and responsible duties of his noble office, he may find that comfort that comes to the faithful doers of God's will, and be consoled with the holy thought that He who wounds bindeth up and although God smites, it is His hand that healeth again.

G. DEUTSCH,
M. LEFKOWITZ,
JACOB SINGER,
FREDERICK COHN.

The first resolution was adopted unanimously and a copy of the same endorsed to the bereaved family.

The second resolution was likewise adopted and a copy ordered sent to Professor Lewy.

The third resolution was likewise adopted and copies ordered sent to the widow and to the Rabbinical Seminary at Berlin.

The fourth resolution met with similar action, a copy being ordered sent to Doctor Adler.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

The report of the Committee on Bible Fund was presented by its chairman, Rabbi David Philipson, and on motion adopted. Rabbi Deutsch asked to have his vote recorded in the negative.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BIBLE FUND.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Inasmuch as the new translation of the Bible is being prepared under the auspices of the Conference in conjunction with the Jewish Publication Society, it is fitting that the members of the Conference put forth efforts to raise funds in their various communities for the furtherance of the work.

We recommend that the Bible Fund Committee issue a special appeal to our members, setting forth our obligation to do all we can towards establishing a Bible Fund and urging them to take steps to secure subscriptions.

We recommend further that the Bible Fund Committee address a communication to the congregations presided over by the members of the conference, calling upon them to contribute to the extent of their ability to the Bible Fund.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID PHILIPSON, *Chairman*,
MARTIN ZIELONKA.

Rabbi Joseph Stolz, chairman, presented the report of the Committee on Prayer Book Revision. The report was adopted and the committee discharged.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

Your Committee on Prayer Book Revision, beg leave to report as follows:

The Union Prayer Book is used in more than 300 congregations and institutions and is circulated in more than 100,000 copies. This is eloquent testimony to its intrinsic work and its adaptability to our spiritual needs.

Seventeen years of usage, however, have shown the need of some verbal changes and other modifications. Yet your Committee deems it inadvisable and impracticable to formulate these changes before the old plates shall have been used up and both the Book of Personal Prayers and the new selection and version of Scriptural readings shall have been definitely adopted by the Conference.

Your committee therefore requests to be discharged without thanks.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH STOLZ,
MAX. HELLER,
TOBIAS SCHANFARBER.

The Auditing Committee, Rabbi George Zepin, chairman, presented the following report:

REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE.

We, the undersigned, to whom were referred the reports of the Solicitation Committee, the Treasurer, the Publication Committee, and the Corresponding Secretary, beg leave to report that the same have had our careful consideration.

I. We recommend the work and the plans of the Solicitation Committee. We congratulate the Central Conference of American Rabbis on the financial status in which it finds itself.

II. We would call attention to the fact that the report of the Bloch Publishing Company is not accompanied by the report of an expert accountant, as was directed by previous Conferences.

III. We recommend that the voucher check adopted last year be put into use at once.

IV. We find a difference between the report of the Corresponding Secretary and the Treasurer in regard to the amount of money credited to the Relief Fund and Tract Fund due to variation of book-keeping. We recommend that this matter be referred to the Executive Committee, so that the moneys may be properly distributed, and each fund get credit for what rightly belongs to it.

V. We would further recommend that the date of June 10th, be fixed for the closing of all books, accounts and statements rendered to the Conference, so that your Committee may have some basis for comparing the various accounts.

VI. In the Treasurer's Report Article 1 and Article 2 are concurred in.

VII. In the request of the Publication Committee as to the printing of Prayer Books on Bible paper, we heartily approve of the suggestion, if it be practical, but as no printing of Prayer Books will be done this year, we suggest that the matter be left for the next Conference, and would ask that in the meantime the committee furnish figures as to the relative cost for paper, binding, etc., and also their opinion as to the effect of this change on the sale of other styles of book.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE ZEPIN,

GEORGE FOX,

A. R. LEVY,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

I. E. MARCUSON.

Section I was adopted. Section II was referred to the Executive Committee. Sections III, IV, V, VI, and VII were adopted. The report was then adopted as a whole.

Rabbi S. Schulman then presented the report of the Special Committee on the recommendations contained in Rabbi Schanfarber's paper.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN RABBI SCHANFARBER'S PAPER.

Your committee to which were referred the resolutions on ethical instruction in the public schools and the introduction of the study of sex hygiene, recommend the following for adoption:

Whereas it is the sense of this Conference that ethical instruction should not be given without the religious sanction and *Whereas* this Conference believes that the secular character of the public schools should be maintained sacred and inviolable.

Be it therefore resolved: that this Conference go on record as opposed to the introduction of ethical instruction in the public schools, save as it is incidental to the school activities and in connection with the regular secular studies prescribed in the curriculum.

With regard to the introduction of the study of sex hygiene in the Public School, the Conference is not yet ready to pass thereon.

S. SCHULMAN,

C. LEVI,

G. ZEPIN.

The first resolution was read.

Rabbi Berkowitz—I find myself in complete disagreement with this resolution. The opening statement seems to me somewhat loose. It says: "Whereas, it is the sense of this Conference that ethical instruction should not be given without religious sanction." Now, I believe we all agree that ethical instruction ought to be given with religious sanction, but I doubt whether we are ready to say that instruction of that kind shall not be given unless it be absolutely and solely religious instruction. . . . There is a kind of ethical sanction in the policeman's club, and some people can understand no higher sanction than that. There is a kind of ethical sanction in utilitarian philosophy; it is good as far as it goes, but it is not the best. So there may be other sanctions for ethical instruction. Hence I do not believe that this statement is the exact truth. The most vital and essential sanction is that of religion, but by no means should we exclude every other kind of sanction. It is only in this respect that I take objection to the wording of

the resolution. In the public schools it is possible to teach ethics. It must be left to the option of the parents of the children, as to what kind of sanction they desire the ethical instruction to have. Whereas, we all agree that there must be a religious sanction, we are likewise to agree that that kind of sanction may not be enforced in the public schools. For that reason we have the religious schools of the different denominations.

Rabbi Deutsch—I hope this resolution will not pass. It is a meddling in political affairs, and is likely to involve us in a great deal of trouble. It practically declares in favor of parochial schools. You certainly are opposed to parochial schools and certainly wish to retain the secular character of the public schools. . . .

Rabbi Feuerlicht—I have considered this matter very thoroughly during my ministry and I have come to this conclusion, that we should go on record that religious instruction shall be given in the public schools; that ethical instruction shall be given in the public schools, and that each religion shall have its representative teacher.

Rabbi Rosenau—I trust that this resolution will not pass. I am in favor of ethical instruction by personal influence alone, incidental to the various disciplines of the public schools.

Rabbi Morgenstern—There is a wrong premise in this argument as I see it, viz: That ethical instruction should not be given without religious instruction. The first question is, "Can ethical instruction be given without religious instruction?" Some authorities hold that it can. The only thing upon which this Conference is agreed is that there should be no religious instruction in the public schools. But, if ethical instruction be possible without religious instruction, then it is a stultification of this Conference to declare before the world that you can not and should not give ethical instruction without religious instruction. I hope this resolution will not prevail. It would be a mistake for this Conference to go on record that because we are opposed to the teaching of religion in the public schools, we will likewise oppose all positive ethical instruction, when many authorities greater than we, insist that the latter can be given without the former, and the question is consequently still open.

Rabbi Aaron—I am opposed to this resolution, because it does not represent our feelings in this matter. It is a sort of subterfuge. We all agreed that religion should not be taught in the public schools. I have had personal experience with a great many teachers some of whom are fanatically religious. I remember that on one occasion a teacher was present at one of my services and after the benediction she told some of her Jewish friends that she was thoroughly outraged by the character of the benediction. She felt like rising in that great assembly and calling me to book for not blessing that congregation in the name of Jesus Christ. That was a teacher in one of our public schools. Now we want to prevent that feeling from cropping up in the public schools. We do not want any sectarian teaching, but we do want ethics in our public schools, and there is no reason why a teacher should not teach the Ten Commandments in the public schools as well as in any of the religious schools.

Rabbi Mayer—It is high time for us to indicate our stand clearly, to issue a declaration of principles on this question. It seems to me this proposal of Brother Schanfarber clearly enunciates the principles by which we should stand. The religionists have been urging and insisting that we have sectarian instruction. We have been opposing that. When they found the ground taken from under their feet, they came to the conclusion that if we can not have religious instruction we will have ethical instruction. Has sectarian instruction in France been successful? The writer of the paper says not. He says the statistics show an increase in crime in France in the last decade, and to such an extent that formal religious instruction in the public schools has been a failure.

Rabbi Philipson—I believe with the last speaker that this is a matter of principle, and we ought to be very careful. I am entirely in accord with the committee, but I believe the committee's expression is somewhat loose, and I will, therefore, offer an amendment. I will read it:

“Whereas it is the sense of this Conference that ethics derives its highest sanction from religion and whereas this Conference believes that the secular character of the public schools should be maintained inviolable;

"Be it, therefore, resolved, that this Conference go on record as opposed to the introduction of formal and systematic ethical instruction in the public schools. This shall not be understood, however, as opposition to ethical instruction as it is incidental to the school activities and in connection with the regular secular studies prescribed in the curriculum."

I believe this Conference should go on record as opposed to the introduction of formal and systematic ethical instruction in the public schools.

Rabbi Schulman—I accept the amendment.

Rabbi Gries—I have brought to this Convention a collection of books, prepared to serve as text-books for ethical instruction in the public schools as an illustration I would take "Ethics for Children," the author of which is a member of the Massachusetts Board of Education. This book is being adopted in many of the schools of the country and was proposed for adoption by the Cleveland Board of Education. The circular which puts this book before the public contains this statement: "This book is entirely free from partisan or sectarian bias and is founded on the broad basis of Christian ethics." That is what the average educator understands by ethics, or ethical instruction. I had to protest to the Board of Education to which this book was submitted and have them to eliminate it on account of the sectarian and Christian allusions. . . . It is on account of these things that we ought to make a clear declaration of principles.

Rabbi Lefkowitz—I am opposed to this motion. We are treading upon dangerous ground. We are planning to interfere with certain things that are being done in our public schools, which in no way interfere with our religious convictions. In most of the State constitutions there is a provision that children shall be instructed in morals, and at the same time these constitutions provide that there shall be no religious instruction. Shall we then say that we desire, as a conference, to contradict the different State constitutions of this union? Are we going to say that we, as a Conference of rabbis, do not wish to live in accordance with the constitutions of the various States, but desire that they shall be radically changed? I believe we have nothing to lose and everything

to gain by admitting the possibility of ethical instruction in our public schools, and leaving the religious sanction to our own Temples and the various church denominations throughout the country.

President Heller—I am heartily in favor of these resolutions. I think that they are splendidly worded. But I want to oppose their adoption at this meeting, because it seems to me a sense of proportion is lacking in dealing with a question as important as this, and about which we differ so pointedly, in the short time at our disposal. A year should be given for preparation and an entire day assigned for discussion. Otherwise this will result only in an immature expression of the sense of the majority. Let us remember that whether we pass these resolutions or whether we refuse to pass them, we shall stand before the country in a very delicate position. Refusing to pass means putting ourselves on one platform, and passing them means putting ourselves on another platform. I would move you as a substitute that the whole matter of these resolutions be deferred for consideration next year.

Rabbi Philipson—I will ask the speaker if he will accept this addition to his motion, that the Executive Committee be instructed to send this resolution as amended to every member of the Conference with the information that this shall be discussed at next year's Conference.

President Heller—With great pleasure I will accept that.

Rabbi Gries—I should like to ask the president this question: What does he think will be the influence and the impression if this Conference does not act upon this resolution, now that this difference of opinion has been expressed here?

President Heller—We shall frankly state, and our discussion will show in our Year Book that the time left us in this eleventh hour is far from sufficient to do justice to so important a subject; that is the impression that will go forth.

The previous question was then called for.

President Heller—The previous question has been called for. Will you state your motion with your addition, Rabbi Philipson?

Rabbi Philipson—I move that the Executive Committee be in-

structed to send out very early this year to every member of the Conference a copy of these resolutions as amended, and that a time be set for the discussion of this question at next year's Conference.

The motion carried.

The Committee on President's Message, Rabbi Joseph Stolz, chairman, next presented its report.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

To the President and members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Committee on President's Message begs leave to report as follows:

It is with a deepening sense of our responsibility that we contemplate the fact that the Jewish communities in America are attaining an eminence of supreme importance in the Jewish world. To the solution of the problems incident to the vast immigration of our co-religionists, our American-Jewish communities, have brought heroic sacrifices in befriending and welcoming the immigrant and providing as far as possible for his welfare in the new world.

I. We recommend that the members of the conference urge their respective congregations to further the educational, social, industrial and religious well-being of the immigrant, and especially to welcome their children in our religious schools.

II. Recognizing that the lives and deeds of the great scholars, teachers and preachers of Reform Judaism should widely be known by our people, we recommend that the members of the Conference be requested to preach on Sabbath, Dec. 30, on the life and work of Ludwig Philippson, the centenary of whose birth occurs December 28, 1911.

III. We recognize with gratification the growth of a broader democratic spirit in the administration of our congregations and religious schools, and strongly recommend that the C. C. A. R. through its members encourage their respective congregations to make membership possible for all who desire it.

IV. The committee recommends the adoption of the report of the Sabbath-school Text Book Commission as follows:

Your committee, acting upon the recommendation of the President of the Conference, and under the instruction of the Conference, and under the instruction of the Conference which declared that the time has come for the Conference to widen its sphere of active work by preparing and publishing text-books for our religious schools, planned to submit to this Conference a method for procedure.

Your committee, however, welcome the official communication, through Mr. Walter Freiberg, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congre-

gations, and through Rabbi Zepin, Director of the Synagogue and School Extension Board, of the general plan and programme of the Union with reference to the publication of Jewish text books, and of the organization of a Board of Editors, giving ex-officio representation to the Central Conference of American Rabbis, through its President, and the Chairman of its Religious Education Committee, and to the Jewish Chautauqua Society, through its Chancellor.

Be it resolved, That the Central Conference of American Rabbis express its hearty approval of the proposed project of the Union, urge the need for its prompt and efficient execution, and offer the earnest co-operation of the Conference towards its successful fulfilment.

Be it resolved, that the sentiment, here expressed, and the Resolution of the Conference be officially conveyed to the President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

V. With reference to the passage in the President's message in regard to Christian Science, we recommend that the Executive Committee consider the advisability of having a paper prepared on the subject for the next Conference.

VI. We note with gratification the growing evidence of good-will among nations and record our hearty appreciation of the impulse given by the President of the United States toward the practical realization of the prophetic ideal: "Nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

We therefore hope that proposed international arbitration treaties between the United States and other countries be speedily ratified.

VII. In the survival of such isolated people as our brethren, the Falashas of Abyssinia, we see a remarkable example of the religious constancy of the Jew. Feeling that we have a duty to the Falashas to secure for them the religious instruction they crave, and to safeguard them against the zeal of the Christian missionaries,

We recommend

(a) The Conference shall send its fraternal greetings to the Falashas, and express to them the sincere joy of the Conference over their loyalty to Judaism.

(b) The Conference shall affiliate itself with the International Pro-Falasha Committee, and the sum of \$25.00 annually shall be contributed by the Conference to the work of the Committee in behalf of the Falashas.

(c) The members of the Conference shall be requested to become individual contributors to the Pro-Falasha Fund and to urge their respective congregations as well as religious schools to contribute to the same cause.

The Executive Committee shall inform the President of the U. A. H. C. of the readiness of the members of the Conference to serve as members of local Pro-Falasha committees to be appointed under the resolution of the Executive Board of the U. A. H. C. by the President.

VIII. (a) In view of the rapidly increasing clerical work of the Conference, we recommend that Art. VI, Sec. I of the Constitution be amended by changing the words "Recording Secretary, Corresponding Secretary, to "Secretary," and the word "eleven executive members" to "twelve Executive Members."

(b) We further recommend, that the Executive Committee be empowered to allow a sum not to exceed \$600.00 for the present year to be expended for clerical aid to the Corresponding Secretary.

At a time when many conflicting policies and measures are being devised for meeting the problems of our Jewish life, we heartily endorse the statement of the President "that religion is the *raison d'être* of the Jew and that it is as representatives of a religion, not of a race, that we have a right, without detriment to our citizenship to plead for our oppressed brothers in benighted lands, and for our undiminished rights in our own country." Jews, standing before the world as a religious community, natural and proper representation should include their religious leaders.

IX. We therefore recommend that a new standing committee be appointed. The chairman of this committee shall be the President of the Conference by virtue of his office, and one of its members shall be the chairman of Committee on Church and State. This committee shall be known as the Committee on Co-operation. Be it resolved that official notification of this action be given through the Executive Committee.

We take pleasure in offering to the President the congratulations of the Conference upon his successful administration.

Signed,

JOSEPH STOLZ, *Chairman*,
S. SCHULMAN,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
LOUIS WITT,
CHARLES S. LEVI,
LEON FRANKLIN,
MOSES J. GRIES,
ISAAC L. RYPINS,
SOLOMON FOSTER, *Secretary*,
WM S. FRIEDMAN,
S. N. DEINARD.

On motion the report was taken up seriatim.

Recommendations I and II were adopted.

Recommendation III was read.

Rabbi Witt—I feel with the deepest conviction that the compromise of my recommendations as just read is colorless, and spineless, so much so that although my congregation is waiting on the

action of this Conference as to what it may do the coming year, I am going back with a sense of defeat that a more positive and courageous statement was not made by the moral leaders here. I wish to read the compromise I suggested. I simply ask this Conference to say that the dues of our American congregations should be lowered. I would like to see this resolution moved or I would like to see the proposition deferred for one year more, and the members asked to consider this matter just as they were asked to consider the matter of ethical instruction in the public schools. I offer this as a substitute motion.

"The Conference recognizes that it is right and sound in principle that there should be a lowering of the minimum rate of dues as a condition of membership; that the privilege of voting should be granted to every member regardless of the rate of his dues; and that the pews should be open and unclassified; and it urges the practical application of these principles wherever and as far as warranted by local conditions."

Rabbi Berkowitz—I appreciate fully and heartily the sentiment just now pronounced. I came to the Conference trusting that there might be some clearly defined expression of principle on this subject. It is now under consideration by my congregation. It is bringing a larger democratic spirit into the congregation. And I should go home likewise depressed and disappointed if the Conference fails to give those of us who are working in this direction a word of encouragement, or at least a statement to the effect that the principle is an honest one, even though it may be very remote as yet in the possibility of its fulfilment. We who are the men of ideals, to whom the people look, not for mere concrete material values, but for spiritual values in congregational life; we want some help from this organized body of religious leaders.

Rabbi Feuerlicht—I am deeply impressed with what Brother Witt says, and I feel in justice to him and in justice to all of us that the same procedure should be taken as in the matter of ethical instruction; that it should be laid over until next year; that we should have a full year for consideration and then vote on it intelligently.

Rabbi Philipson—We recognize the principle of this recommendation; but we want to leave it to each congregation to do as it feels right.

Rabbi Franklin—I want to say that the recommendation of the committee was made after very careful deliberation; nevertheless, Dr. Philipson and other members of the committee will remember there was not that same unanimity which seems to be the impression of some of the speakers. There was a very decided difference of opinion in regard to the matter, and the very differences that arose in the committee are being brought forward here on the floor this afternoon. This is a matter of more importance than some of the members of this Conference seem to believe. There is a growing sentiment throughout the land for some such expression as that asked for by Rabbi Witt. However, I do not believe that the recommendation as phrased by Rabbi Witt ought to be adopted. I believe that it goes a little too far in its recommendations. I, for one, could not announce myself as quite ready to recommend to the congregations throughout the land that the privilege of voting should be granted to every member regardless of the rate of his dues. There are certain property rights involved in a membership of a congregation which make this inadvisable. But I do believe that some expression of our feeling in this matter ought to be put on record. There is a growing demand for the greater democratizing of our synagogues. I, therefore, agree with Doctor Berkowitz that something not quite so weak, not quite so general, as the resolution of the committee should be adopted. If we are not now in a position to re-phrase the resolution as framed by the committee, and if we are not prepared to accept the amendment as offered by Rabbi Witt, then I should be most heartily in favor of deferring the matter until another year, until it can be given adequate consideration.

The substitute motion was lost. The original recommendation was adopted.

Recommendations IV, V, and VI were adopted, the latter by a rising vote.

Recommendation VII (a) and (c) were adopted; (b) was referred to the Finance Committee.

Recommendation VIII (a), being an amendment to the Constitution, was laid over for action until the next Conference. VIII (b) was adopted.

Recommendation IX was adopted.

Recommendation X was adopted by a rising vote.

The report was then adopted as a whole.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions, Rabbi Henry Berkowitz chairman, was next presented and adopted as a whole.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

During the past year widespread and vigorous efforts have been made for the suppression of the "White Slave" traffic. This evil is not local but international and not limited to any particular creed or race. We therefore note with great gratification the assembly of an international conference at Madrid; the activities of the various governments abroad, of our own federal government; the enactments of more rigorous legislation by 29 states in the Union and the general co-operation of press, pulpit and other public agencies resulting in the diffusion of information and the exercise of powerful moral influence to overcome this evil.

We, the C. C. A. R. in annual convention assembled heartily endorse these and all other efforts of the kind and urge our members to give their best efforts to guard the Jewish home and the purity of the Jewish character.

The suggestion of the committee on a contemporaneous history to give publicity to a refutation of the blood accusation we consider would be ineffectual and of little value now and recommend the omission of the same.

We recommend that the resolution on mausoleum burial, referred to this committee, be submitted to the Committee on Responsa for an opinion.

Respectfully submitted,
HENRY BERKOWITZ, *Chairman*,
MENDEL SILBER,
MARTIN ZIELONKA,
LOUIS WITT,
SAMUEL HIRSHBERG,
JULIUS RAPPAPORT.

The report of the Committee on Thanks was read by its chairman, Rabbi Israel Aaron, and was adopted unanimously and by a rising vote.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THANKS.

To the President and members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Thanks begs leave to submit the following report.

Before closing the 22nd Session, the C. C. A. R. considers it a pleasant

duty to express its sense of gratitude and profound appreciation of the many acts of great kindness and graceful courtesy, of which it has been the recipient from the community of St. Paul.

Rarely has the Conference been entertained with such engaging and lavish hospitality, and in few other places of meeting has so much real interest in its proceedings been manifested, or such ready and full sympathy for its work and aims been displayed. With deeper significance than the formal utterance indicates, we want to thank Mt. Zion Hebrew Congregation and its honored and ever-obliging rabbi and courteous officers, who placed at our disposal their beautiful House of Worship, and who devoted themselves with such kindness, energy and forethought to the arrangement of every thinkable requirement for the welfare and success of our meeting.

We also want to thank the Choir, whose inspiring singing so helped to beautify our opening services.

We are especially grateful to the various committees, the ladies and gentlemen, who have so unstintedly ministered to our needs and comforts, and in every way did so much to facilitate the conduct of our business and the despatch of our work; and to make our periods of leisure supremely pleasant and enjoyable.

Our thanks are due to Mr. and Mrs. I. Dittenhoefer, and Mr. and Mrs. William L. Goodkind for the delightful receptions given at their home.

We also desire to express our special appreciation of the kindness of the community of Minneapolis, and its honored and genial rabbi, in permitting us to enjoy so delightful a day in their midst, and in entertaining us with such superb hospitality in their beautiful city.

To the Press of the City of St. Paul and Minneapolis, we are under great obligations for space liberally accorded, and for the fair reports of our proceedings which it published.

We want to assure our hosts and friends, in the Twin Cities that we account it a privilege to have met here, and that the delightful sojourn in their midst, spent under conditions so pleasant, and in surroundings so congenial will abide with us as one of the pleasantest recollections in the experience of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Signed,

I. AARON, *Chairman*,

EUGENE MANNHEIMER,

J. FEUERLICHT,

JOSEPH KORNFELD.

Invitations to the next Conference were extended by Niagara Falls, N. Y., through Rabbi Joseph Jasin and Denver, Col., by Rabbi William S. Friedman. On motion the question of time and place of the next Conference was referred to the Executive Committee.

The report of the Committee on Nominations was then read by its chairman, Rabbi David Marx.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Nominations unanimously submits the following names for your consideration:

<i>Honorary President</i>	Kaufman Kohler
<i>President</i>	Samuel Schulman
<i>Vice-President</i>	Moses J. Gries.
<i>Treasurer</i>	Leo M. Franklin
<i>Recording Secretary</i>	Julian Morgenstern
<i>Corresponding Secretary</i>	Solomon Foster

Executive Board: Israel Aaron, Gotthard Deutsch, Harry Ettelson, William S. Friedman, Ephraim Frisch, Maxmillian Heller, Harry H. Mayer, David Philipson, William Rosenau, Isaac L. Rypins, Joseph Stolz.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID ALEXANDER,
HARRY ETELSON,
CHARLES FREUND,
JOSEPH KORNFELD,
HARRY H. MAYER,
JOSEPH RAUCH,
WILLIAM ROSENAU,
L. JACOB ROTHSTEIN,
DAVID MARX, *Chairman*.

On motion the report was adopted unanimously and the Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Conference for the officers nominated in the report.

The thanks of the Conference to its retiring officers were expressed by a rising vote.

After thanking the Conference for the honor he had enjoyed of being its President and for the co-operation of the members during his administration and their attention and courtesy during the session, retiring President Heller introduced the new President, Rabbi Samuel Schulman, who spoke as follows:

President Schulman—Before proceeding to voice the feelings which are natural to one in my position, I will give myself the pleasure of expressing my sense of appreciation of the whole-souled

service which the out-going President gave to this Conference during the last two years in which I have had the privilege and pleasure of being associated with him as Vice-President. I endorse every word he has said in respect to our experience in this Conference. The Conference is growing in its own self-reliance, in the knowledge of its own resources and in its own perfect poise and self-mastery, and I believe that our convention in St. Paul, will for many reasons, be a noted one in our history, and one of the important reasons is that it has produced on the whole the best evidence of merit and wisdom; a Conference in which large serious work was done; a Conference in which excellent papers were read; a Conference in which many vital questions were handled with dignity, though not without energy; with the zeal of positive convictions, though not lacking in kindly courtesy and consideration for the colleague; a Conference of perfect harmony and peace, not in a rhetorical sense, which sometimes makes the phrase empty, but in a real sense; and that that was possible is in no small measure due to the spirit of ministering help from the presiding officer that loved to weigh and deliberate and to see the right and light of many sides of the question. It gives me great pleasure thus to speak what was in my heart with respect to the out-going president.

In voicing my feelings of appreciation I believe that I do not exaggerate when I say that this is one of the happiest moments of my life. I believe that the English-speaking people have really a correct standard with respect to the decision of the worth of men. They say a man is to be judged by his peers. I believe in all walks of life this is a fact. I do not care how great a man is; I do not care how inconspicuous a man is; he is to be judged by what his peers think of him, and when they have honored him it is one of the momentous and high-water marks of his life. It is, therefore, a great pleasure for me to know after twenty-one years of ministry in this country that I have reached the stage when my colleagues of the Central Conference of American Rabbis have not thought me unworthy of electing me to the office once held by Isaac M. Wise. This pleasure and this sense of honor, let us speak it frankly, is for me enhanced by a peculiar and individual thought. This Central Conference of American Rabbis is a conference open to all

rabbis, in this country, of attainment, of worth and of service on behalf of Judaism in America, irrespective of shade of thought or belief, irrespective of origin or education, irrespective of any consideration. According to the conception of the great man who founded the Conference, it was to be a catholic body, inviting hospitably every one that wished to enroll himself in the army on behalf of American Judaism. But as a matter of fact, the weight of authority, the assumption of responsibility, as the representative of American Judaism as it is expressed in Conference before the American public, were carried on the shoulders of the alumni of the Hebrew Union College, of which the founder of the Conference was the master and the teacher. And it is for the first time in the history of the Conference, since the death of this great master and teacher and leader and organizer, that it has elected a man who has not the honor to be a member of that body of alumni of the Hebrew Union College. And a man would be conceited indeed, considering all circumstances, if he were not to recognize the peculiar honor this involves; and I, for one, hesitate not to voice my sense of this honor, and to express my gratitude to all members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis for the distinction conferred upon me in this election. I pray God that he will help me in realizing all my ideals, and all my hopes and aims with respect to the great opportunity offered to the Central Conference of American Rabbis as a Jewish body equipped for work greater than any other Jewish organization; and I hope my ideals in respect to it will be realized, with the co-operation of all the rabbis of the Conference, who, I trust, will help me make this administration a successful one. I thank you.

Adjournment.

The closing prayer and benediction were delivered by Rabbi G. Deutsch. The Conference then adjourned sine die, the hour being 1:10 p. m.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION PROPOSED.

The following amendments to the Constitution were offered in the course of the Convention:

In view of the rapidly increasing clerical work of the Conference, we recommend that Art. VI, Sec. 1 of the Constitution be amended by changing the words "Recording Secretary, Corresponding Secretary" to "Secretary," and the words "eleven executive members" to "twelve executive members."

Proposed by the Committee on President's Message.

Amendment to Art. VII, Sec. 1:

In place of the section as at present, this section shall read as follows: This association shall meet annually in general convention the week after Passover at such time and place as the previous Conference or its executive board shall decide.

DAVID PHILIPSON,
JULIAN MORGENSTERN,
DAVID MARX,

In order that the Conference may be free to hold its annual meetings at the places and under the conditions which shall be most favorable to its influence upon the country, and the best development of its work, it is hereby moved to amend Art. VII, Sec. 1 of the Constitution by striking out the words "in the month of July."

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES,
ISAAC L. RYPINS,
LEO M. FRANKLIN,

Amendment to Art. III, Sec. 1, to read as follows: All active and retired Rabbis of congregations and Professors of Rabbinical Seminaries shall be eligible for membership. All applications for membership shall be acted upon by the Executive Board.

JOSEPH, STOLZ,
DAVID PHILIPSON,
MAX. HELLER.

SUMMARY.

Forty-six members were in attendance.

317 Prayer Books were distributed gratis during the year among eleemosynary and penal institutions.

The Executive Committee reported having sent engrossed resolutions to Mr. Claude G. Montefiore of London, Eng., in appreciation of his presence at and participation in the Charlevoix Conference.

Reports and papers presented before the Conference must hereafter be in triplicate and a time and space limit set and observed for papers.

A further subvention was granted Ehrlich's "Randglossen" by the Executive Committee.

The Solicitation Committee reported gross receipts of \$673 for the Fund for the Relief of Superannuated Rabbis and \$516 for the Tract Fund. It was decided to print the names of contributors, individuals and congregations, in the Year Book. The members of the Conference were urged to persuade their congregants to remember these two funds in their wills and bequests.

The Publication Committee reported that 283 congregations and 20 institutions are now using the Union Prayer Book. New Editions of the Prayer Book, Hymnal and Haggadah had been issued during the year.

It was decided not to establish a Pulpit Bureau at present, following the recommendation of the Committee that dealt with this subject.

A form for the Conversion Certificate was adopted. The Certificate is to be printed in three folds, one to be retained by the officiating rabbi, one given the proselyte and the other filed with the Corresponding Secretary.

The sympathy of the Conference was extended to Chief Rabbi Herman Adler of England on the death of his son, Reverend S. Alfred Adler, and his brother, Marcus Adler. The death of Dr. Michael Friedlander, London; of Hirsch Hildesheimer, Berlin; and of Rabbi Maurice Fluegel, Baltimore, were also lamented and memorial resolutions adopted.

A special Memorial Service was held in memory of the late Professor Ephraim Feldman, of the Hebrew Union College. It was decided to set aside a separate page of the minutes for appropriate resolutions in his memory, a copy of which was ordered sent to the widow.

The felicitations of the Conference were extended to Professor Israel Lewy of the Rabbinical Seminary at Breslau on the occasion of his seventieth birthday celebration.

The centenaries of the birth of Ludwig Philippson, Leopold Loew and Leopold Stein were commemorated by the reading of special papers on these three scholars and leaders of Reform Judaism. It was decided to desig-

nate Sabbath, Dec. 30, 1911, as the proper occasion for the members of the Conference to preach on the life and works of Ludwig Philippson, the centenary of whose birth falls on Dec. 28th.

Decided progress on the composition of the new Hymnal was reported by the Committee on Synagogal Music. It was voted to print a provisional text of the words for the scrutiny of the members of the Conference. It was further determined to make the subject of the Hymnal a special order of business at the next Conference.

The Committee on Church and State reported having received letters promising co-operation in the movement seeking to stop lampooning of the Jew on the stage from nearly all the managers of theatre syndicates, including John Cort, Klaw & Erlanger, Lee & S. S. Shubert, Martin Beek, Sullivan & Considine, Alexander Pantages and William Morris. It also reported that the Cable Company promised to eliminate the offensive song "Solomon Levi" from all its publications in the future.

This Committee further reported that, with the co-operation of the Department of Synagogue and School Extension of the U. A. H. C., there had been distributed 14,000 dignified press notices concerning the Jewish holidays and that these had been used almost exclusively by the newspapers.

It was voted to appoint local representatives of the Committee on Church and State throughout the country to safeguard Jewish rights and combat Jewish misrepresentation in the press, on the forum, etc.

In addition to being ordered to continue the practice of sending out press notices of the holidays, the Committee on Church and State was ordered to send through its local representatives a calendar of the Jewish holidays to presidents of universities and superintendents of schools, requesting them to avoid setting registration and examination days on the Jewish holidays.

It was decided to request the University Committee to eliminate the study of Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice from sub-college curricula.

The Conference unanimously endorsed the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois prohibiting the reading of the Bible in the public schools of that state.

By a rising vote the Conference passed a resolution calling upon the President and Congress of the United States to abrogate the existing treaty with Russia because of the latter's discrimination against American citizens of the Jewish faith in the matter of passports. The resolution was transmitted by telegraph.

Sabbath Zachor was again named as the Sabbath when rabbis are to give attention in the services to the persecution of co-religionists in foreign lands.

The Religious Education Committee was instructed to complete the census it began of Jewish children receiving religious training and to

prepare descriptive catalogues of the Exhibit, and of teachers' reference books and a children's library.

The Conference endorsed the plan of the Jewish Chautauqua Society to establish a Correspondence School for teachers and pledged its co-operation.

The Committee on Religious Education was directed to outline a plan of religious instruction for adolescents.

Final action was taken with regard to the little volume of "Personal Prayers" which will be issued during the coming year as a companion volume to the Union Prayer Book.

It was decided to ask the I. O. B. B. to urge all its component Districts to appoint chaplains to minister to Jewish prisoners in their regions, after the example of District No. 2.

The Department of Synagogue and School Extension of the U. A. H. C. will be asked to take a census of Jewish delinquents.

It was voted to name a certain Sabbath in the year for discussing from the pulpit the moral aspect of labor.

The members of the Conference are to urge their congregations to contribute to the Bible Fund in order to further the work of translation now going on.

It was decided not to revise the Union Prayer Book until the present plates are used up and the new book of Personal Prayers and the new Scriptural Readings are definitely adopted by the Conference.

The question of the propriety and value of formal, systematic ethical instruction in the public schools was the subject of a paper and a long debate. In view of the importance of the problem, it was decided to make it a special order of business at the next Conference.

Congregations are urged to make membership possible for all who desire it. They are requested to welcome and befriend the immigrant and especially to throw open their religious schools to his children.

The Conference decided not to go into the enterprise of publishing religious text books under a Commission of its own, but to accept representation through its President and Chairman of its Religious Education Committee on the Board of Editors to be organized by the U. A. H. C. to undertake that work. The Conference heartily endorsed the plan of the Union in that direction.

The Conference noted with gratification the impulse given by the President of the United States toward the spread of amity between nations and heartily endorsed international arbitration treaties between the United States and other countries.

The Conference voted to send its fraternal greetings to the Falashas of Abyssinia, expressing its joy over their loyalty to Judaism. Rabbis and

congregations and religious schools are urged to contribute to the Pro-Falasha Fund.

Owing to the increasing duties of the Corresponding Secretary, the appropriation for clerical aid to that office was doubled.

A new standing committee, proposed by the Executive Committee, and to be known as the Committee on Co-operation in Emergency was created. This Committee is to co-operate with similar committees of other Jewish organizations on occasions when Jewish rights at home or abroad are endangered. The President of the Conference and the Chairman of the Committee on Church and State must be members of this Committee.

The Conference approved strongly of all efforts being made to suppress the "White Slave" traffic.

In Memoriam

Professor Ephraim Feldman

Resolution adopted by the Central Conference of
American Rabbis, in Convention assembled,
at St. Paul, Minnesota, July Sixth,
Nineteen Hundred and Eleven.

THE Central Conference of American Rabbis in annual convention assembled at St. Paul, Minnesota, hereby records its great sorrow at the death on November 16th, 1910, with such startling and tragic suddenness, of its honored colleague and co-worker, and eminent teacher in Israel,

Ephraim Feldman

For over a quarter of century his brilliant gifts of mind and heart were given to the education of those who were to become the moral and spiritual teachers of the American Jewish people.

We extend our sincere sympathy to the bereaved wife and sorrowing children, assuring them that while they mourn the loss of a devoted husband and father, we grieve over the untimely taking away of our beloved associate and friend.

May they be consoled with the thought that the life of their beloved dear one has exemplified the words of Scripture: "They that are wise shall shine with the brightness of the firmament; and they that lead many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever."

G. DEUTSCH	}	COMMITTEE
FREDERICK COHN		
M. LEFKOVITS		
JACOB SINGER		

A

MESSAGE OF RABBI MAX. HELLER, PRESIDENT OF
THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
RABBIS, TO THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CON-
FERENCE, AT ST. PAUL, MINN., JULY 2, 1911.*Colleagues and Friends:*

Every age, it has been said by way of truism, is an age of transition; there are, however, periods of epochal fermentation and ours is one of these, especially for Judaism and markedly for the American Jew. If the last nine or ten decades have witnessed a series of revolutions: in methods of transportation and communication, in the range of industry and commerce, in the expansion of science and education, in political, civic and social life, such as has rendered the distance between 1910 and 1810 essentially greater than was that, say, between 1810 and 1510, these same decades have brought to the Jews of the occidental world an upheaval of outward conditions and a change of spiritual atmospheres to which, in width and depth, even our dramatically varied history offers scarcely a parallel.

The life-task of the Western Jew, as the gates of opportunity swung open for him, seemed to consist principally in rapid adaptation to citizenship in the modern world and in the preservation of his faith amid a radically changed environment. After centuries of wandering in the wilderness of fanaticism the Jew had been admitted to what seemed to be a promised land of equal opportunity, of civic and social fellowship; he felt, whether articulately or inarticulately, that in the Palestine of the modern world the old ark would have to dwell in a new temple, that the tabernacle of the desert would prove unfit for his new Jerusalem.

REFORM IN THE LIGHT OF BIOGRAPHY.

Whatever might be said with justice as to the errors and extravagances of the Reform movement, however true it might be

that in some of their theories and practices the great leaders of Reform Judaism were swept along, sometimes too far, by temporary currents, the time is coming when sober history must accord to these men the important place that rightfully belongs to them in the steadfast evolution of Judaism. Reform Judaism can not be explained out of such base and petty motives as mere love of comfort or the demagogue's desire to please, out of any mania of imitation or any cringing to the Gentile, from a mere mixture of indifference, vanity and self-contempt. As we study the lives of these scholars and writers, these preachers of the living word, at the calmer distance of their centennial birth-anniversaries, as we pass in review their struggles and their sufferings, the toil and the inspiration with which they fought their way onward, we can not but realize the intense Jewish enthusiasm which moved them to take upon themselves the martyrdom of the pioneer; we come to understand that, if in countries of small Jewish populations, like England or France, or of less advanced civilization, like Austria and Russia, Reform Judaism was unable to gain a foothold, the reason lay neither in a deeper religiousness nor in a more tender loyalty to the old, but largely in the lack of the profound modern scholarship, of the lofty moral courage, of the tireless, virile energy that animated the immortal pioneers of Reform.

THREE JEWISH WORTHIES.

We have paid the tribute of our reverential gratitude, in previous gatherings, to Holdheim and Geiger, to Einhorn and Adler, as we did to Samson Raphael Hirsch and Gabriel Riesser, to Rashi and Moses Chaim Luzatto, when some centennial landmark of each historic figure recalled to us his respective share in the unfoldment of Judaism. We are called upon, at the present convention, to commemorate the centennial birth-anniversaries of three protagonists of Reform: of Leopold Stein, Leopold Loew and Ludwig Phillipson, who illustrate, in diverse and yet co-ordinate spheres, by activities that have much in common, and which yet, in each case, bear the stamp of strong individuality, in what divergent ways the Reform idea appealed to gifted men of widely different tastes and endowments. All of these three men

were ardent patriots, friends of liberty, enthusiastic champions of enlightenment; all of them were preachers of distinction, though their methods of preaching and their habits of emphasis lay along diverse paths; while Phillipson was the Jewish journalist par excellence yet both of the others were active for years in the service of religious journalism; while Phillipson and Stein attained a measure of success in the field of poetry, fiction and the drama, Leopold Loew combined scientific scholarship with rare eloquence and lofty courage, until he became the dominant figure in Hungarian Judaism. They were strong, brave men, these three, no timid compromisers or slavish imitators; all of them endowed with that glow of responsive fancy which knows how to revere the past, how to value the poetry of association and the wealth of meaning that reside in symbol and ceremony; each of them, at one time or another in his life, demonstrated his capacity for generous self-sacrifice in the service of ideal causes. To review their lives is to feel that, with few exceptions, the Reform movement enlisted in its cause the born religious leaders of the day, the men who, devotedly loyal to the past, yet appreciated and yearned to serve the needs of the present as well as the demands of the future.

THE RUSSIAN EXODUS.

Until the beginning of the ninth decade of the last century, as has been said, two problems were paramount with the Jew of all Western countries: how to adapt himself, the individual and the community, to his newly won position as a citizen and how to preserve his faith amid a radically changed material and spiritual atmosphere. Difficult as these problems were, complicated far beyond the similar problems of our non-Jewish fellow-citizens in all lands, far as we should still have been from their solution, had we been left undisturbed to the task of working them out, they have been, in a measure, crowded back by the appearance of an emergency, the true proportions and the momentous significance of which we may possibly be unable to appraise at our point of nearness. Anti-semitism was born out of primitive hatreds decked out in scientific guise and, largely under its ægis, the mediæval depotism of Russia, leagued with the untamed savagery of the Muzhik,

brought back into our day the heinous carnage of Crusade and Black Death, reinforced by all the degrading and extortionate legal oppression which modern ingenuity can devise and which unprincipled corruption renders quite incalculable. As a consequence, our day has witnessed a mass-migration of Jewish refugees which, at least in numbers, surpasses every similar catastrophe in the records of Judaism. Whether this greatest of all Jewish migrations will prove a blessing in disguise by hastening the day of Eastern Jew's deliverance from the bondage of mediævalism, by consummating an unprecedentedly wide dispersion of the Jew, with whatever advantages, under modern civilization, may finally accrue from such dispersion, or whether the lot of Russian Jewry is to be the irremediable scandal of modern civilization, this much seems certain that, beyond all other parts of the world, our great republic has been the chosen destination of these wanderers, that, just as the latter middle age created a great Jewish center in the Empire of Poland, so our own day is witnessing the rise of another great Jewish center in our country, the proportions of whose future may be divined from the impressive fact that it boasts, even now, the possession of the largest Jewish community which has ever been harbored in one city.

THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE.

We have been told by eminent and far-seeing European coreligionists, again and again, that the future of modern Judaism rests with us. Some years ago this prediction was based, in the main, partly upon the boundless range of American opportunity, partly upon the perfect freedom of unfoldment we seem to enjoy above our coreligionists of all other lands, in the absence of a State Church on the one hand and of any strait-jackets of ecclesiastical organization on the other. Latterly, similar statements have rather had in view the rapidity of our numerical growth, the prospective mingling of various strains, the leading position we are likely to occupy among the several divisions of English-speaking Jewry.

RIISING TO THE EMERGENCY.

We ought not so much to be elated with pride over an eminence which circumstances have created for us, rather filled with a grave

sense of responsibility as we ponder the weighty and far-reaching tasks which Providence is assigning to us. The question we ought to address to our conscience at such a critical time is this: whether we have, indeed, risen to the height of the moment, whether we are handling the towering problems of the hour with that largeness of vision, with the statesmanlike grasp and calmness, with the patriotic spirit of self-sacrifice for which they call. Have we met the emergency by not merely providing for the momentary need, but by planning ahead, by forestalling future complications? Has the seriousness of our duty tended to unite us to concerted measures and shared sacrifices, or have we left the burden, almost altogether, to those who happened to live nearest to our gateways? Has our generosity and our readiness to help been commensurate with the needs of the immigrant and the dangers that lurk in his distress? Have we devised our policies, at such a time, with a ripe consideration of every lesson from our history, especially of the cautions which are imposed upon us by the character of our mission, as a people bound together by the religious tie?

I shall leave it to each individual to answer from his own observation, to what extent we have proved equal to the momentous call, and how far we have left unchecked the rising evils of congestion, either through shortsightedness, unbrotherliness or disunion. Upon one point, however, it will be timely to dwell, upon this central truth that must determine, at all times, our methods of dealing with great emergencies: that religion is the *raison d'être* of the Jew and that it is as representatives of a religion, not of a race, that we have a right, without detriment to our citizenship, to plead for our oppressed brothers in benighted lands, or for our undiminished rights in our own country.

OUR RAISON D'ETRE.

In addressing a rabbinical convention it would almost seem presumption to labor the patent truth that religious teaching and religious example are both the outstanding achievement of our past and the sole justification of our survival, the cement of every loyalty that holds us together. Yet, as an ardent Zionist, who has always avowed his convictions as such without hesitation or re-

serve, I owe it to you and myself to forestal some of the misunderstandings that haunt the popular mind in this connection. In my view and to my feeling the religious life must be the crown and summit of any full-blown culture; the real point of divergence between Zionism and anti-Zionism can not be the question, as it is sometimes crudely put, whether we are a religion or a race, but whether we shall achieve our religious mission as a people scattered to the four corners of the globe, or as a nation upbuilding a typical culture upon its ancient soil. Upon the fact of the religious nature of our mission, there can be no difference save between extremists, either of nationalism at the one end, or of assimilationism at the other.

With this fundamental fact in view it must be matter for regret and condemnation that, as we organize slowly towards co-operation on behalf of Jewish causes, we should so often lose sight of our ultimate aims and aspirations in the single effort towards practical ends. Fortunate as it may be that representative bodies like the Congregational Union, the American Jewish Committee and the Order of B'nai B'rith are willing to combine their great influence for the protection of Jewish rights both here and abroad, yet the policy of an exclusively lay representation where the rights of religious equality are in question is one that can not but lead to deplorable misunderstandings. The rabbinate, both orthodox and Reform, should be asked through its official organizations, to participate in all important conferences on behalf of endangered Jewish rights, if only to testify to the world that the bond between Jew and Jew is, in the main, a religious one.

At its meeting of January 16 in New York City your Executive Committee appointed a standing committee which should co-operate with the three organizations above named towards safeguarding the civil and religious rights of our brothers both here and abroad. The rabbinate of the United States ought to be officially represented in all important movements of that kind; your committee should be given authority by the deliberate voice of this convention.

MISSIONARY DUTIES IN JUDAISM.

For many years past our Conference, conscious of our religious mission, has partly planned, partly accomplished much important work towards the propagation of Judaism, by the free distribution of prayer books and other publications, by the issuing of holiday sermons and tracts, through our Lyceum Bureau, as well as through the labors of committees and individuals who studied the religious needs of the university student, workingman, farmer and of the defective and delinquent classes. Judaism is not a missionary religion in the aggressive sense of the term; that which is technically called missionary effort derives its strength from theories of exclusive salvation to which Judaism is a stranger. Yet the very completeness of our abstention from missionary propaganda in this particular sense has given rise in many minds to the notion that Judaism can afford to be indifferent to religious defection and to the spread of ignorance, that it is not our duty to enlighten the Gentile world as to our faith and that no particular obligation rests upon us to provide religious education for any of our brothers except those of our immediate circle. Such opinions will hardly ever find articulate expression; to utter them is to expose their absurdity; yet they correspond with erroneous impressions, vague, but none the less obstinate, which have much to do with the indifference and insensibility to duty that prevail in hardly any field more widely than they do in that of religious education.

THE STATUS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

That we are in the midst of a general awakening in American Jewdom on the importance of religious education must be patent to every observer. Year after year we realize more keenly how small a portion of the Jewish population is being reached by such provisions as exist; not only in huge centers like New York City are we becoming alive to the fact that our present resources are altogether inadequate to an effective coping with the problem, but all over the country, with comparatively few exceptions, there is a sense of dissatisfaction relative to the inadequacy of provisions for religious education, both as regards the numbers that are reached and the methods that are being pursued. In attacking

this vital problem a number of organizations: the Congregational Union, the Jewish Chautauqua, the Council of Jewish Women, have pursued their separate ways by various methods, while our Conference has, through its committee on religious education and, latterly, by assigning an entire day to discussions of the subject, contributed materially to the clearer envisagement of these problems.

THE NEEDED TEXT-BOOKS.

In last year's annual message I took occasion to commend to your consideration the advisability of creating a series of text-books for our religious schools, a proposal which had been made to the Conference a decade before. There were good reasons for surmising that other bodies would take up this work, should we, on one ground or another, decline to undertake it. At times some particular problem or other presses irresistibly upon public attention, until some competent agency comes forward to cope with it. Such a time has evidently arrived for the problem of the text-books to be used in our religious schools. From many different organizations, the Union of Congregations, the Woman's Council, the Jewish Publication Society, the New York Kehillah, not to mention the attempts and enterprises of individuals, the demand is voiced for adequate text-books, and steps are being taken towards the supply of that demand; all this simultaneous agitation in one direction will go far towards proving the timeliness of last year's suggestion. At the same time your officers are in receipt of a protest from the President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations claiming that that organization has been first in the field of text-book publication, that its editorial board is composed exclusively of rabbis, and that it would be an unwise expenditure of energy and a wasteful expenditure of money for allied organizations to duplicate each other's work. Our commission on religious text-books will, no doubt, report at length on the subject. The question ought not to be viewed from the mere circumstance of priority, but from the point of fitness and final efficiency; our Conference should, in a spirit of unselfish endeavor, co-operate whenever feasible towards the best results; our principal criterion should be the best interests of religious education which will be

subverted by concerted effort, rather than by the splitting up of senseless and wasteful rivalries. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that by far the largest number of modern religious schools is under the care of the members of our Conference, and that any text-book, to attain extensive use, will have to meet with the approval of those who are at the head of the schools which it is to serve

DEFECTS OF CONGREGATIONAL POLICY.

For a number of years we have found that the financial resources of our Conference were not equal, without outside assistance, to the effective serving of a number of movements which we had initiated from a sense of their urgent need. The systematic and extensive publication of tracts, the provision for superannuated rabbis and their dependents, the launching of a new Bible translation, all of these and others are obligations that ought to appeal to the Jewish congregation as coming distinctly within the purview of its duty and appealing legitimately to its support. It has been submitted, and the necessity will have to be insisted upon repeatedly until it is duly realized, that the financial budget of our Reform congregations should assume a broader spirit of liberality, that congregations and their officers need to be taught by their spiritual leaders the duty of helpfulness which they owe to the interests of Judaism beyond the narrow pale of congregational prosperity. Our appeal to this effect has been heeded in many quarters, although we are as yet far from having obtained the support that will enable us to render effective service. Another serious deficiency of congregational organization will be dealt with in one of the papers to be submitted for your discussion. The complaint has been voiced, from time to time, that the basis of membership in our congregations is, especially in the large cities, so narrow as to restrict it virtually to the circles of the well-to-do; the evil is a two-fold one, fostering a spirit of exclusiveness on the part of the rich member and of irresponsibility on the part of the poor non-member; the introduction of the free pew, prompted though it be by a commendable spirit of democracy, does not remove the unjust exclusion of the poor from their right of having a voice in the direction of the congregation. The difficulty is one which is likely

to grow in importance with the growing affluence of our congregations and with the steady rise of classes of refined and intelligent people who find themselves shut out from congregational membership by the prohibitive amount of congregational dues. Practical though its principal aspect may appear, it is bound, unless remedied in time, to have important bearings on our religious life and progress.

"THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE" JEW.

One of the Round Table discussions of last year's convention revolved around a topic which has pressed more and more to the forefront of public debate in the last few years: the question of our attitude towards the movement known by the name of "Christian Science." Since our last convention the prevailing discussion of the Jewish attitude towards this movement has passed from the academic to the practical stage. District No. 4 of the Order B'nai B'rith, at its annual convention, adopted a regulation according to which a Jew who follows the tenets of "Christian Science" becomes ineligible to membership in the Order. This rule which seems to be in a good way of finding favor with other districts, amounts to a declaration that adhesion to this movement involves an abjuration of Judaism. That a secret Order should deem it necessary thus to declare heretical a movement which seems to have gained adherents in Jewish circles, is deserving of note; it would seem, at least, to call for some expression on our part. Our Round Table discussion of last year was altogether informal, and, leaving no record in our Yearbook, gave no intimation to the public as to the light in which the American rabbinate is disposed to view an aberration that has misled many of our coreligionists. An attempt at an authoritative declaration would be premature at this time; it may, however, be advisable, under the circumstances, to assign to some capable member the writing of an exhaustive paper on the subject, with discussion and possibly a well-matured resolution to follow, or else to select the subject as topic for a suitable tract.

THE WIDER SCOPE.

As a conference of rabbis we are principally concerned with matters which have a direct bearing on the welfare of Judaism

and the functions of our profession. At the same time, both as citizens and as ministers of religion, we must share in the wider moral and religious interests which affect the general well-being. Prompted by these considerations our Conference has devoted thought to the social evil and aroused the attention of its members to the crying shame of the White Slave Trade, perplexities that appeal for relief to all humanity; during the past year, in a spirit of enlightened appreciation, the Tercentennial of the King James Bible has been adverted to in many of our pulpits; the endeavor of the two great Anglo-Saxon governments to bring about an Anglo-American Treaty for the settlement of all differences by methods of arbitration ought to elicit from this convention some expression of cordial approval.

LOST TRIBES.

As the remotest corners of the world are being drawn into the light of knowledge and the fellowship of intercourse by the expanding circles of modern research and commerce, there come to the Jews of civilized countries, from time to time, messages from isolated groups of their brothers who have been out of touch with the general body of Jewdom for centuries and who, while staunchly resisting complete assimilation, have become estranged, in the course of long periods, from their religion as well as from the rest of Israel. Such instances are furnished by the remnant of Chinese Jews at Kaifengfu, the B'ni Israel of far off India, by the Falashas of Abyssinia. There is something in the survival of such isolated tribes amid the most unfavorable of environments that bears eloquent testimony to the religious constancy of the Jew; there is a touch of romance in the reunion, after centuries of separation, with divisions of our great people that had been lost and almost forgotten, some of whom have faithfully preserved traditions and practices that have long passed out of existence in the wider evolution of Judaism. We have a duty towards these rediscovered brothers, to assist them in their poverty, to secure for them the religious instruction they crave, to protect and strengthen them against the wiles and lures of the missionaries who are holding out every inducement to rob them of their faith. A communication

has been addressed to this Conference on behalf of the Falashas by Dr. Jacob Faitlovitch, who some years ago undertook a trip of exploration to their country and who is at present seeking to enlist our interest in this country on their behalf. His request for aid and his suggestions of co-operation will, I am sure, receive the favorable consideration of this Conference.

PROF. EPHRAIM FELDMAN.

During the past twelve months the Conference has sustained the loss of one of its most highly esteemed members in the death of Prof. Ephraim Feldman, of the Hebrew Union College, who passed away, by a pathetic coincidence, on the very day when his faithful work of many years was to receive its meed of public recognition. Many of our members had been his pupils in past years and recall with abiding gratitude the thoroughness and conscientiousness of his methods, his sincere concern in the welfare and progress of those under his instruction, the shrinking modesty and the high aspirations that marked his personality. While he was but rarely able to attend our gatherings, yet our Conference has had the benefit, at times, of his ripe scholarship and ready co-operation. In the hearts of his pupils and friends his memory will live as that of a born teacher who served his work with unselfish devotion.

OUR GROWING WORK.

In the twenty-one years of its existence our Conference has steadily expanded its sphere, until its activities now reach out to many fields, concentrating many responsibilities into the hands of its officers, requiring the division of work among numerous committees, calling for careful apportionment of expenditure and for the most expedient methods of organization. It will not be advisable, in this place, to review the work of committees the reports of whose progress will be presented by their respective chairmen; perhaps our most important undertaking at this time is the editing and publication of our new Hymn Book, for the consummation of which it may be necessary to furnish the committee with larger means; some of our committees will ask to be relieved

of their functions in the absence of present need; others have completed their work of years for final adoption.

Two suggestions have been made for the benefit of expediency and efficiency in the work of the Conference which seem to commend themselves as likely to redound to our advantage: the appointment of a permanent salaried secretary or clerk, who shall attend to the rapidly increasing task of correspondence and general secretarial work, and the incorporation of our Conference as a chartered body to enable it to receive donations and bequests of all kinds and from all sources in legal form.

A WORD OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

In receding from the responsible office with which you have honored me for two terms I am filled with a sense of appreciation for the confidence you have reposed in me; throughout my term of office the feeling has steadily grown upon me of the unbounded potentialities of our organization for the uplifting of Judaism and of my own inadequacy to the invaluable opportunities for leadership and co-operation that present themselves at so pregnant and critical a period as the present. I am indebted for many kindnesses and favors, as well as for prompt and willing service, to all the officers and to the chairmen of committees; while many complaints are rife, in our organization as in all societies that serve higher ends, regarding indifference and unpromptness on the part of the membership, yet a large proportion of our members is ever unselfishly ready to sacrifice time, labor and means in the pursuit of our work.

Having sought the seclusion of a summer retreat for our deliberations of last year we are again gathering in a Jewish center, as the guests of two flourishing communities. May our proceedings be blessed with the spirit of earnestness, concord and general good will; may they spur us on, through friendly exchange and cheering companionship, to courageous endeavor; may they tend, with our hearers and among all Israel, to "increase and glorify the Torah."

"For the sake of my brethren and my companions let me bespeak peace for thee; for the sake of the house of the Lord our God I will seek for thy good."

B

THE OPPORTUNITY OF LIBERAL JUDAISM
IN AMERICA.

(Conference Sermon Delivered Saturday Morning, July 1, 1911,
at St. Paul, Minn.)

BY RABBI MOSES J. GRIES, Cleveland, O.

It is a privilege to preach to Rabbis, teachers and leaders in Israel, yet I am fully conscious of my responsibility and of the difficulty of bringing any new interpretation to those who are masters in the field of Jewish thought. We value our annual Conference, for the personal contact of friend with friend—for the corrective of thought, by free and open discussion—for intellectual inspiration and for the encouragement we bring to one another. We understand the difficulties of the religious teacher and the discouragements of the Rabbi—teaching ideals not understood—living a life of service, often not appreciated—heart and soul and strength being freely spent, many times without apparent achievement.

If we be honest with ourselves, we must make fearless recognition of the evils in our religious life—the weakness of religion and of Judaism—the disregard and the desecration of the Sabbath—the breaking down of the once beautiful Jewish home life—the neglect of and indifference to religious education. We who are in earnest are saddened by the want of understanding and the lack of interest on the part of those born of Israel. We are deeply wounded by their ignorance of and their indifference to the life story of the Jew. They are unjust to their own history and to their own glorious heritage.

I am conscious that this may be heralded as a new confession of the failure of Reform. Would that the critics of Reform were as honest with themselves; that they would as frankly recognize the evils in the religious life about them and as fearlessly search

for the real causes of the complete failure of orthodoxy, in holding the older generation, not alone in America, but in lands in which Reform Judaism never existed and certainly never exercised any real influence.

We should not magnify the reactionary retrogression. Neither should we be alarmed nor confused by the continued beating of drums. All of us have heard the blare of trumpets, announcing a new leader and heralding a new epoch. "The wish is father to the thought," or perhaps "necessity is the mother of invention."

It is my deliberate judgment that the whole retrogressive movement is based on a false diagnosis of conditions and of causes, and that the remedies offered are without wisdom or reason. I should be inclined to put more faith in the reaction, if somewhere it were a reality, with life and with power. Life is the supreme test. It is not enough to talk about Judaism. We must live it.

It is a time of moral and social crisis in the religious world and in the Jewish world, yet leaders in Israel are insistent upon conformity rather than upon conscience. They seem to value ceremony as more powerful for life than conduct, and ritual more than righteousness. The modern world needs the awakening of conscience; individual, corporate, national and international. The age demands a re-birth of moral passion. Therefore, we liberals are so insistent upon the Jewish ethical emphasis and have so little confidence in a religion of pots and pans, of rites and ritual. Neither internal dietetics nor external genuflections will save the modern Jew. *Needed* for the Jew and for the world is the *Jewish ethical interpretation*, vital and with power, of life, of the world and of history.

Are we successfully grappling with our moral and religious problems, in the search for truth and in the application of truth to life, in the development of moral ideals, and in the inspiration of youth? Efficiency is the new watchword. Do the churches and synagogues give the impression of efficiency? In them are not manifest, enthusiasm and energy, effort and power. They are not distinguished for organization—the union of forces—the power of the spirit, for the uplift of human kind.

Conservation is the cry of this generation. The utilization of the waste products, in commercial and industrial life, means the

enrichment of the individual and of the nation. Behold the waste of moral resources, of the moral influence of the historic church, of the moral power of men and women and youth and children.

That religion and that temple are not power-producing, are not work-accomplishing, whose life-stream rises to flood tide three times in the year and then steadily subsides and through the year runs with a stream so thin that it has no more real power than a tiny rivulet. There is glorious power in human hearts and souls. A very Niagara of human energy and human enthusiasm is running to waste.

The weakness of synagogue and church are manifest. Heedlessly, the hosts of men and women hurry by. They will not hear the message of religion. Religion seems divorced from the realities of life. Unmistakably clear is the weakness of religion. In the life of the individual, there is no religious enthusiasm and in the life of the city and nation, it wields no vital power. Therefore it is that the temple must lead and guide, and must interpret the whole of the life of men ethically—not to save an individual soul, but in order to save human society.

The Jew needs a living temple, with a living religion for the Jews of this generation. We dare not be content with an ephemeral Judaism, which, like the ephemera, lives but a single day.

Let us look the Sabbath problem squarely in the face. It will never be solved by rhetorical rhapsodies about Sabbath Candles; nor yet by a pleasant glossing over of real difficulties in religious belief and religious life. Let us work for a genuine Sabbath for the Jew—a day of rest in honor of God, for worship and for spiritual upliftment. I am unwilling that an hour on Friday evening or Saturday or Sunday morning shall be Sabbath for the chosen few, while the vast multitude of Israel remain Sabbathless and religionless.

What mean I by a "living temple?" A living temple must be a house of worship to God, but for men and women and children. A living temple must be a house of instruction, but not only for children, also for men and women, in the high obligations of life. O, yes, our hope is with the children, to teach them to honor their noble heritage, that they should treasure the precious jewel which now the world would claim for its own.

Pardon me, if I speak the truth bluntly. Not a Jewish congregation in this land fulfills its obligations. Hosts of children may be in some of our religious schools. We do not even make an earnest endeavor for the older boys and girls. I speak without reserve. *I believe there is not one congregation in the country which successfully reaches men and women, young men and young women, boys and girls.*

A living temple means important religious and social work; not with the children of the poor, the children of immigrants, but with the children of the well-to-do and of the rich; our own children. It is the chief business of the church to teach the godly life, for the making of manhood and womanhood, for the building of human character. Wise is Liberal Judaism in its appeal to youth and to children—the generation of the present and of the future. Oh, that we might be blessed with power to fire the soul of the youth of America; to give direction to youth's flaming enthusiasm that it does not burn out in mere wasted idealism and vain aspiration.

And the spirit of this living Temple—the living Temple must be open, open for worship, open for school, open as a social center, open to every influence that leads to the nobler development of life; open for the brotherhood of the rich and the poor; open for the fellowship of Jew and Non-Jew.

I am not affrighted by the cry and the charge "assimilation." The word for the most part is meaningless—never yet clearly explained. I believe in human relationship between Jew and non-Jew, and in their honest friendship. Social ostracism in America, though invisible, contains within it a germ of portentous evil. It is a menace to true liberty. He who in free America solves the problem of social ostracism, would be a benefactor to free America and to the Jew.

I believe in the right of Jew and Christian to fellowship. Jews and Christians may meet without compromise or surrender, but with mutual respect for the life and the faith and the truth of both.

Liberal Judaism has a duty also to the immigrants, in the great cities and in the smaller communities throughout the country. Let

us not build, nor suffer to be built, a wall of separation between Jews and Jews. Here is opportunity and also obligation to the immigrants, to the generation of youth and to their children, who in America, have been freed from Old World conservatism and from ancient authority. The immigrant elders visit our temples, their youth often worship in the Temple rather than in the Synagogue, and their children throng our religious schools.

Never again will there be the old Judaism. A world-wide transformation has come in religion and in Judaism. This is the historic significance of the centenary celebrations of the life-work of Einhorn and Geiger, of Stein and Loew and Phillipson, who in the century past transformed, yes reformed Judaism.

The Liberal Jew must interpret ancient Judaism to the modern world. He speaks to the twentieth century. Education has changed the thought of the world. Never again will mankind hold the former views of religion. Intercommunication has changed the whole face of the globe. Never again will the Jew be an isolated nation.

I believe in the mission of the Jew, and I believe that mission to be in the world and to the world. Ours the duty to proclaim our Jewish thought to the world in which we live; not to convert the world, but to teach mankind the Jewish view of life and of history. The time will come when we shall regret that we have not been inspired by the missionary enthusiasm. It was my thought, twenty years ago, in the early enthusiasm of my ministry, and it is my sober judgment to-day, that we would have done well, had we endeavored to give a *true interpretation of the Jew and Judaism, of his life and of his history*, to the great peoples of the Orient, the Japanese and the Chinese, destined to dominate millions of mankind. Their hate of the Jew has not yet been implanted. They have never been civilized enough to have learned Jew hatred.

Why should not the Jew be missionary, in an age when the ideals of the prophets of Israel are nearer fulfilment than ever before in human history? Let us not be robbed by intellectual anti-Semitism of the distinction which rightfully belongs to the Jew of history.

What is our justification of the Jew? What answer do we make to the world? We boast of his noble life-record—the glory of the race—the achievements of Jews. Proudly we proclaim, the Jew lives, in spite all persecution and oppression! It is wonderful! But it is a narrow interpretation of Jewish history and of Jewish thought. Far more meaningful would it be to discover why the Jew lives, for what purpose his life has been preserved, of what he is representative in the life, the history and the civilization of mankind.

The Jew is historic teacher; by the appointment of history he is the interpreter of the spiritual. He should be the man religious. The Jew should be a man of God and live as though God were in the world.

An obligation rests upon the Jews of America. Judaism has survived the yoke of bondage and the sword of oppression. Judaism must prove itself triumphant under freedom. Judaism must be a *religion of freedom* and not a religion of persecution. Not forever must our characteristic note be the wail of sorrow, under the pangs of suffering, with unceasing martyrdom. We have been delivered from the ghetto walls. We must be emancipated from the ghetto spirit. Our Judaism must inspire life under freedom.

Only a free, emancipated Judaism will ever be a true world religion. Therefore some of us are so insistent that the Jew and Judaism in America shall be American and not Oriental. Our American Jewish congregations are not Oriental transplantations. They need not appear Oriental in the form and language of worship, nor yet in the practices of life.

Therefore, our protest is so earnest, that we shall not be accounted "alien" in the land of our adoption. Therefore, with all our power, we resent the declaration that we are "in exile"—physical, political or spiritual, in the land of our birth.

Let us proclaim to the world, our interpretation of world history and of Jewish history—not only of the past, of the meaning of prophecy, of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the nation—but also of our duty in the present, in lands of freedom, and of our destiny in the future, among the nations of the earth.

The Jew's place is in the world. We could not, and if we could, we would not, undo the liberalizing work of the nineteenth century, in Judaism.

Dear Rabbis and friends—what makes our work worth doing—what makes our life worth living? Not success, nor money, nor fame, nor power; but the unfolding of human life and the building of human character. Ours the privilege and the obligation to teach. Ours the rare opportunity to cultivate the spirit. Ours the opportunity and the obligation to impress this generation—to teach Judaism to the children, to the generation of youth growing to manhood and womanhood.

God grant that there be sincere fellowship between leaders and teachers, representatives of the historic cause, and that there be granted to them, power and wisdom for true leadership.

C

LUDWIG PHILIPPSON.

BY RABBI JOSEPH S. KORNFELD, Columbus, O.

Writing in the year 1898, Alfred Russel Wallace said, "Both as regards the number and the quality of the onward advances, the age in which we live fully merits the title I have ventured to give it—The Wonderful Century." The nineteenth century was indeed in every respect a century of unrivaled progress. Especially notable, however, was the progress of the Jew and Judaism during that time. True, the spirit of the Lord hovered on the face of Israel in the darkest period of the world's history and even in Mizrayim, as the Middle Ages are designated by Samuel Adler, "the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." Yet both as regards the number and the quality of Israel's onward advances, the nineteenth century fully merits the title—The Wonderful, if not the most wonderful century in the annals of history. Prior to its advent, Judaism was the religion of the ghetto and the Jew the dreamer of the ghetto; at its close Judaism was a universal religion and the Jew a man with a world mission. How account for this marvelous change? Carlyle says, "All the things that we see standing accomplished in the world are properly the outer material result, the practical realization and embodiment, of Thoughts that dwelt in the Great Men sent into the world."¹ And fifteen hundred years before him, Rabbi Judah Bar Simon said "vayomer elohim: jehi or, zeh abraham; vayeji boker, zeh yaakob."² It was the great Jewish reformers who made the nineteenth century a century of light in the life of Israel. They brought enlargement and deliverance to the Jew and Judaism. Of these none was more active in sowing the seeds of light, none more valiant in fighting

¹Carlyle: Lectures on Heroes, The Hero as Divinity.

²Bereshit Rabbah 2:4.

the battles of the Lord than Ludwig Philippson—The Isaac M. Wise of German Judaism. To him, therefore, was vouchsafed the blessing: "Hear, Lord, the voice of Judah and bring him near unto his people; let his hands be sufficient for them and Thou shalt be a help against his adversaries." (Deut. 33, 7.)

PHILIPPSON'S EDUCATION.

Ludwig, the second son of Moses and Marianne Philippson, was born December 28, 1811, in the city of Dessau, the birthplace of Moses Mendelssohn. His father, a great grandson of Jacob Joshua Heschel the author of *Pene Joshua*, though a product of the old yeshiba, had acquired thorough command of the German language and was well versed in mathematics, geography, and Hebrew grammar. At an early age he had chosen teaching as his life work and, when, in 1799, the Freischule of Dessau was opened as the Franzschule, in honor of its generous patron Duke Leopold Friedrich Franz, Moses Philippson was called to the post of head teacher. There he began a literary activity which would surely have secured him a high place in the realm of letters, had it not been cut short by his untimely death on April 20, 1814. He was survived by his wife and four children, the youngest being 9 months and the oldest 7 years of age. Of material wealth they inherited but little. Yet of infinitely greater value was the legacy of a noble memory that was bequeathed to them. When urged to lighten her burden by putting her boys to work, Marianne would reply, "The sons of Moses Philippson shall not become clerks or peddlers." Thanks to the idealism combined with the practical wisdom of this brave woman and the assistance of her oldest son Phœbus, the education of Ludwig was not allowed to suffer.

Throughout his school days Philippson was highly favored, both in the quality of the schools and the caliber of the teachers. When barely four years old he was sent to the Franzschule. His quick perception, diligent application and retentive memory made his progress very rapid. Introduced into the study of Hebrew at an exceptionally early age, his interest therein, greatly stimulated by his older brother Phœbus, steadily increased. Yet while his mind and eyes pored over the pages of classic and Hebrew literature,

his heart never failed to leap up at the sight of the objects of architectural and scenic beauty in which Dessau abounded, for Philippon was of poetic nature. Though from his childhood a book lover, he never could become a book worm; for his soul was ever soaring.

At the age of 15 he was admitted to the Oberquarta in the gymnasium of Halle. Here he soon distinguished himself by his splendid translations of Virgil and Ovid. As heretofore, he pursued his Hebrew studies under the direction of his brother Phoebus, then studying medicine in Halle. The latter taught him also French, anatomy, physics and the history of art. Extraordinary as is the many sided interest he evinces already at this time, even more remarkable is his keen penetration into the spirit of every subject that occupies his mind. Shortly after taking up the study of northern mythology he composed "Die Blueten des Nordens," a series of epics in which the weirdness characteristic of the northern saga is admirably preserved. As an instance of this, the following lines are well worth citing:

"Der Mensch baut sich ein herrlich Gebäude
Mit schlanken Säulen und gewölbtem Gang
Und immer höh'r, das ist des Meisters Freude,
Und Himmelnah', das ist des Erdsohns Drang:
Da schwankt der Grund, o'Truemmer ueber Truemme!ne!
Es stuerzt das Dach auf seiner Säulen Reih
In den Ruinen hört man's klagend wimmern
Es war des Meisters letzter Todesschrei."¹

About this time Philippon wrote a metrical translation of several of the minor prophets. The originality and correctness of this work so impressed Dr. Kurt Sprengel to whom it was dedicated that he insisted on its publication. Accordingly in 1827 there appeared "Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Jona, Obadja und Nahum in metrisch—deutscher Uebersetzung." Though the title page bore the name of Phoebus, it was the work of Ludwig who,

¹M. Kayserling: Ludwig Philippon, p. 20.

as a pupil of the gymnasium, could not publicly declare his authorship. This then marks the beginning of Philipppson's literary career.

On his graduation from the gymnasium in 1829, he repaired to Berlin and matriculated in its famous university. During the first six months at the university he maintained himself by tutoring. Yet finding writing more to his taste, he decided to try it as a means of earning his livelihood. This was a very fortunate step. If he was to support himself by his pen, his style had to be popular, however technical the theme. There can be little doubt that the consummate mastery in the field of journalism for which he became noted in later years was due, in large measure, to his early apprenticeship.

His *Lehrjahre*, however, were not merely a period of preparation. They were productive of achievements that would do honor to a master. Of his university efforts, too numerous to mention, four are especially noteworthy. The first of these is "Ezechiel des juedischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo desaelteren Jerusalem." The literary remains of many a long forgotten Judeo-Hellenic poet were buried in the writings of the Church Fathers. Scattered among these are the fragments of "The Exodus" by Ezekielos, an Alexandrian poet of the second century—the first drama ever written by a Jew as well as the earliest on a Biblical subject and the poem "Jerusalem," by Philo the elder, another Alexandrian poet. Philipppson collected those fragments and, having edited them, he published them in 1830 together with a metrical translation and commentary. This work derives its value not from the intrinsic literary merits of the compositions Philipppson brought to the light of day, but from the fact that it brought into prominence, what was little known to Jews at least, that in addition to the writings of Josephus, Philo and the Apocrypha, there had been many Jewish writers during the Hellenic period who produced considerable poetry in the Greek language and meter.² Forty years later Philipppson again took up this subject and, as a result, we have the series of highly interesting articles

²A. Z. d. J. 1870 pp. 73-75.

"Die juedisch-griechischen Dichter" in the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums" of 1870.

In the course of his philological studies he was struck by the fact that the classics contained much valuable information on anatomy and physiology. Thereupon he wrote two Latin essays, one, "A Comparison between the Views of Aristotle and Plato concerning the Internal Organs of the Human Body;" and the other, "The Views of the Ancient Philosophers regarding the Senses, together with the Fragment 'Concerning the Senses and Objects of Sense' by Theophrastus." These he published in 1831 under the title "Hyle Anthropine." This work is regarded as the best of his early writings and is highly esteemed by philogists and students of the history of medicine.

Of less scientific value, yet highly significant both as a promise and a prophecy of Philippson's future service are the following essays, written in 1832. Gabriel Riesser, the noted advocate of the civic rights of the Jews in Germany, was at this time editing the magazine *Der Jude*. The April number contained an article entitled, "How did the Jews lose their Civic Rights in the Western and Eastern Roman Empires?" Though signed "Ludwig Schragge," the author was none other than Ludwig Philippson. This was considered one of the best works in favor of Jewish emancipation. Having gathered together out of the Theodocian Code those novellæ whereby the Christian Emperors despoiled the Jews of their once undisputed civic rights, he arranges them chronologically and shows that, by the admission of the Emperors themselves as expressed in these novellæ, the Jews had done nothing to justify their degradation and that it was due solely to religious prejudice. This vindication of the Jew in the past fills the writer with hope that the worth of the Jew in his own time will soon be recognized and that, as of old, the mouth that condemned him will pronounce the verdict "Not guilty."

On the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Spinoza, he published "Spinoza als Mensch in seinem Leben und Character dargestellt als Rechtfertigung des Verkannten, als Aufforderung zur Feier des 24. November, 1832." This essay reprinted in the *Jahrbuch fuer die Geschichte der Juden und des Judenthums*

of 1860 under the shorter title "Baruch Spinoza, was the first vindication of Spinoza from the pen of a Jew, anticipating Berthold Auerbach's famous work. As the full title of this essay clearly shows, the task Philippson had set for himself was the defence of Spinoza the man, not the philosopher. In this he was eminently successful. One can not read the life and letters of Spinoza as put before him by Philippson without being convinced that, far from being an atheist, Spinoza was truly God-intoxicated. To quote Philippson, "Spinoza war kein Gottesläugner, kein frevelhafter, die Menschheit befleckender Atheist, sondern ein reiner, edler Mann der da fründig ausgesagt 'Die Liebe zu Gott ist das höchste Ziel des menschlichen Ringen's und Streben's.' So haben wir ihn ausgesprochen-den Namen Benedictus Spinoza, den Namen des Mannes von dem man geurtheilt er möge nicht Gesegneter (Benedictus) sondern Verfluchter (Maledictus) heissen."¹

The vindication of the man Spinoza would naturally lead the unknowing to a condemnation of the synagogue or the Judaism that rejected him. And as a matter of fact, it has been frequently charged that a church that found no room for so noble a life must have been very narrow indeed. To offset this a brilliant modern writer resorts to the following declaration: "For martyrdom and devotion to principle the lot of the Jew and his fortitude are to the fate and steadfastness of Spinoza a crown diamond compared to the paste imitation on the ring of the low, vulgar gambler."² Far more sedately and correctly Philippson points out that this very crown diamond Spinoza could have been found only in the mine of Rabbinism, that Spinoza's steadfastness and devotion to the truth as he saw it, as well as his gentle bearing under the most trying conditions, were virtues characteristic of the Jew—especially him of the rabbinic period. Hence this essay, primarily a vindication of Spinoza, is also a defense of the Judaism which, though rejected by Spinoza, the philosopher, is glorified in Spinoza, the man.

Though undecided, Philippson naturally inclined toward an academic career, having made a special study of philology. On re-

¹Jahrbuch für die Geschichte des Judenthums, 1860: Baruch Spinoza.

²Emil. G. Hirsch: The Jews and Jesus, p. 11.

ceiving his doctor degree from the university of Jena in 1833, he was prepared to enter on his life work. Germany affording very little hope of advancement, he resolved to go to France. Fortunately, however, before the time of his contemplated departure arrived, the congregation of Magdeburg elected him as its preacher and teacher.

PHILIPPSON THE RABBI.

The congregation of Madgeburg was neither old nor large. Prior to 1807, only one Jewish family lived there. At the time of which we speak the Jewish community numbered about 100 families, with M. Salomon as their Rabbi. The latter, a thorough Talmudist and a strict orthodox, had also some knowledge of German and was not at all averse to higher education. His reception to Philippson presents a pleasant contrast to that of Tiktin to Geiger. From the outset the Rabbi and preacher worked together most harmoniously. On Salomon's death in January, 1839, Philippson was elected his successor, having received his rabbinical degree from Rabbi Joseph Friedlander of Brilon. This change, however, affected only the title, not the functions of the office. Philippson had always regarded the Rabbi as essentially a preacher and teacher; and in the capacity of both he had already rendered signal service. As a preacher, Philippson ranks with G. Salomon. Kley and Mannheimer—the foremost Jewish pulpit orators of his day. As a teacher he had no peer, and but few equals. To him the Magdeburg congregation owes the distinction of being the first in Prussia to introduce the regular weekly sermon, confirmation for boys and girls and the first to have a graded religious school in accordance with the principles of pedagogy.¹ Of this school Martin Philippson says "its establishment was greeted with universal approval and the religious schools of Jewish congregations the world over are patterned after it."² "It has found imitators by the hundreds of Jewish communities who no longer know that they are following the example given by Philippson."³

¹M. Kayserling; Ludwig Philippson p. 48-49; Bibliothek Jued. Kanzelredner, 1870, p. 40.

²Martin Philippson: *Neueste Geschichte des Jued. Volkes*, p. 187.

³Martin Philippson: *Louis Philippson, son ouvre et son action dans le Judaïsme Moderne*, p. 3.

Deeply interested in all social and political movements his service in the cause of labor was especially conspicuous. At various times he was editor of and contributor to newspapers devoted to the interest of the industrial classes. In 1849 he was unanimously elected a member of the newly organized council of employers and employees in Magdeburg. For many years he was a leading member of the City Council. His political prominence was not merely local. A champion of moderate yet liberal constitutional ideas, he was a candidate for the Frankfort Parliament in 1848; but on account of the intrigues of the radical element he failed of election. The Neuahaldensleben Wolmirstedter district, however, elected him a Deputy-substitute. At the Parliamentary elections in January, 1849, he was nominated in two districts, being supported chiefly by the laboring class. The reaction was now coming on apace. Philippson the Jew met defeat. In reality, however, it was not he but the ideals of social justice for which he stood that were rejected. Philippson, undaunted, resolved that they shall yet prevail.

On the completion of 25 years of service in his congregation the entire community, regardless of creed or class, joined in a celebration which was more sincere than spectacular. Never having been very strong, and his eyesight now beginning to fail, Philippson decided to retire from the ministry. Accordingly, in April, 1862, he resigned the position he had graced for 30 years. Many a heart was heavy and many an eye tear-dimmed as the friend of young and old, rich and poor, was leaving the scene of his blessed labors to seek rest and refreshment in the beautiful city of Bonn. Little did they think that well nigh 30 more years of activity were vouchsafed unto him. Yet in the bracing air of that salubrious Rhine country and with the loving care of his self-denying wife, he soon recovered his health and buoyancy. He never again entered the ministry. Making Bonn his home, he devoted his entire time to literary pursuits till December 29, 1889 when he died rich in years, rich in honors and rich in never-dying deeds.

PHILIPPSON THE MAN.

At this point it may not be amiss to touch briefly on Philippson the man. Stately in stature, his was a commanding appearance.

His countenance was pale and highly animated. Possessing a rich and sonorous voice, his speech was very impressive. By nature intensely emotional he yet maintained a calm demeanor. This is the picture penned by one who saw him at the Synod of Leipzig.¹ The most striking feature in Philipppson's personality is his unflinching optimism, which, in his case, betokens a transcendent faith. He believes that whatever God does is for the best, and whatever man does is for the better. "Ich glaube an die Menschheit"²—that was his declaration of faith in 1832, and, in spite of his many disillusionments in later years, it remained unchanged and stands as the preface to his *Weltbewegende Fragen* in 1862. He had faith in the ultimate triumph of light over darkness. "Und Licht wird doch nie Finsterniss." For that reason he could afford to be patient.

In argument Philipppson was always incisive, never vindictive. Endowed with strength, he was also endued with grace. His detractors were disarmed by his equanimity. Nowhere in his writings is there any evidence of arbitrariness. The charge that his was a "rule or ruin policy"³ can not be sustained. Though self-reliant, as every leader must be, he was by no means egotistical. In his acknowledgment of the honor shown him by the Baltimore community in naming their B'nai B'rith lodge after him, he writes: "Every man is a child of his time, one of his contemporaries and co-workers, only a member of a larger or smaller circle of those who develop the same thought, pursue the same direction and seek the same goal, even though in diverse ways. The individual therefore, is no more than a co-worker and it were the height of presumption for him to speak of *his* thought or *his* task. At best he is only a fellow servant and a fellow combatant."⁴ Surely words such as these do not indicate overweening pride or arrogance. The fact that Philipppson said that Geiger was no theologian may prove that he himself was no theologian, nevertheless his offense in this regard does not warrant the statement

¹Geschr. Photographien aus der 1 sten Isr. Synode p. 13.

²A. J. d. J. 1837, p. 442-443.

³Emanuel Schreiber: Reformed Judaism and its Pioneers, p. 313.

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1870, p. 81.

that "Like all small men he was vindictive and conceited in the extreme."⁵ Yet if there ever was a man who had cause for self-gratulation it was Philippson, as the following pages will amply prove.

PHILIPPSON THE TOILER OF THE SPIRIT.

Genius, as defined by Turner the painter, is the "capacity for toiling terribly." In addition to his many rare intellectual endowments, Philippson possessed this genius to a pre-eminent degree. Specialists of his time spoke slightly of his works and words, but not one has done so much and very few could have done so well. In the words of Isaac M. Wise "Philippson was not the impractical bookworm that sits within the four walls and looks upon the world through the keyhole of his library. He was not the one-sided journalist or the one-sided reformer. He was not a mere figure. He was an acting factor in our history from 1832 to the end of 1889 and one of the foremost representatives of the third generation."⁶ Varied as his activities were, the purpose was ever the same—Emancipation. "Licht und Recht in der Menschenwelt"⁷ is the final aim of all his endeavors. Believing that humanity can be emancipated only through the universal acceptance of the religious idea of which Israel is the bearer and regarding the emancipation of the Jew and Judaism as the necessary steps leading to this final consummation, he devoted his life to the enfranchisement of the Jew and the enthronement of Judaism.

PHILIPPSON THE EDITOR.

The Jew as well as Judaism were in need of a two-fold emancipation: an outer, political and inner, religious. As the organ of this emancipation, Philippson called into existence in 1837 *Die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*. This he edited from its inception till December, 1889. The appearance of this journal marked an epoch in Jewish history. Not that there had not been other good German Jewish papers before the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, but, in the words of Jost "this was the first attempt to present a

⁵Emanuel Schreiber: *Reformed Judaism*, etc., p. 313.

⁶American Israelite Jan., 1890.

⁷A. J. d. J. 1837 p. 379.

comprehensive view of the life and conditions of the Jews."¹ Speaking in high praise of the services rendered by the German Jewish journals in the cause of Judaism, Gustave Karpeles says: "Among them, the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* occupies the front rank. Its editor, Ludwig Philippson, is not only of the foremost fighter for reform and emancipation, but also the most highly gifted editor in the field of Jewish journalism in modern times. With the rarest foresight, great skill, fine tact and a warm love he has guided this sheet till it has become the focus of all Jewish interests."² Its columns were open to all and its editorials fair to all. The style was simple and elevated, the spirit intense yet liberal. Whatever felt the touch of Philippson became a live topic and never failed to interest the reader. The educational influence of the *A. Z. d. J.* extended beyond German Jewry. Dr. Max Lillienthal, then rabbi in Russia says: "It is chiefly the *A. Z. d. J.* that has spread the rays of German Jewish civilization in the remotest corners of Russia." But even outside of Jewry this paper enjoyed great prestige. Its views on matters of state received the greatest respect and attention. Adolph Jellinek wrote to Philippson "You ought to be the editor not of the 'Jewish Times,' but the 'Times.'" The *A. Z. d. J.* was indeed more than a mere newspaper; it was an institution. Referring to this paper, Simon Szanto the editor of the *Neuzeit* (Vienna) says, "It was Philippson's most meritorious creation. If he had done nothing else he would still be entitled to a place of honor in the hall of fame of Jewish history. In short, in the realm of Jewry he was a publicist with whom none of the editors of weekly or monthly journals that came into existence since the appearance of the *A. Z. d. J.* can be compared, and we doubt whether an editor of a Jewish journal will ever equal him."³

PHILIPPSON A CONSTRUCTIVE GENIUS.

Had Philippson been endowed with no more than a "marktscheiererischem Talente," as Geiger contemptuously says, he might have

¹Jost: *Die Geschichte des Judenthums*, Vol. 3, p. 354-355.

²Gustave Karpeles: *Gesch. der Jued. Literature*, p. 1117.

³M. Kayserling: *Ludwig Philippson*, Chap. 9.

have been content to serve as the voice of the emancipation, even though it proved "a voice calling in the wilderness." But being blessed with the greatest constructive genius, he deemed his mission to make level in the desert a highway for our God, to exalt every valley, to make level every mountain and hill, to make the uneven level and the rough places plain, so that the glory of the Lord might be fully revealed, all flesh seeing it together. He prepared the way by removing "the stumbling blocks out of the way of my people."

CIVIL EMANCIPATION OF THE JEW.

In his tribute to the memory of Gabriel Riesser, Philippson wrote, "We owe Riesser a monument, a monument that may declare to the future generations how dear he was to us, that we knew how to appreciate and honor him."⁴ Foremost among the advocates of the civil rights of the Jews stands Gabriel Riesser, and second only to him is Ludwig Philippson. "Besides Gabriel Riesser none could defend and advocate the rights and claims of his people as he did" is the testimony of Isaac M. Wise.⁵ In a poem dedicated to Philippson on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his rabbinate, Dr. Moritz Rappoport said:

Der rechte Mann zur rechten Stunde
 Das ist der Allmacht grosse That.
 Mit starkem Geist und feur'gem Munde,
 Die Ruesting ist's, in der er naht;
 Und der Gedanke—seine Waffe.
 Das helle Wort—sein Glanzpanier,
 Der Muth—sein Bogen ist's, der straffe,
 Und Menschenrecht—sein Kampffrevier.

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1863, p. 299 ff.

⁵American Israelite Jan. 9, 1890.

Und so ein Viertelhundert Jahre
 Kämpfst rastlos du und unerschlafft,
 Begeistert fuer das Grosse, Wahre,
 Gewaltig mit Gedankenkraft.
 Gilt's wo der Brueder Heil und Ehre
 Rollet deines Wortes Donner schon.
 In Streit und Wort, in That und Lehre
 Stets siegreich Ludwig Philippson."

With Maccabean courage Philippson fought the battles of Israel both at home and abroad. And these were so numerous that the degel mahaneh yehudah was always unfurled and his weapon, mightier than the sword, was never sheathed.

The guarantee of civil rights to the Jews in Prussia by article 12 of the edict of March 11, 1812, soon proved its weakness, and the reaction that followed the wars of liberation was not slow in discovering it. In the first place, the emancipation of 1812 was limited to the civil rights of the Jew and took no cognizance of the status of the Jewish church, promising to regulate that at some future time. Then again in the reconstruction of Prussia by the Congress of Vienna there were restored to it provinces which had been taken from it by the Treaty of Tilsit, and new ones added. Consequently it was very easy for the reactionary party to deprive the Jew of his rights without literally violating the pledges of 1812. The situation became particularly alarming after Frederick William IV ascended the Prussian throne. Being altogether under the influence of the reactionaries he lent a willing ear to their machinations to degrade the Jew. To compass this end the theory of the Christian State was established as a national principle. On the basis of this assumption the Jew could be easily stripped of whatever civil rights he enjoyed. As the entering wedge a bill was proposed by the king in 1842 to exempt the Jews from military duty. Philippson at once realized the gravity of the situation and in the name of 84 congregations besides his own, he petitioned the king, impassionately pleading against this unjust discrimination. The impression this produced was so profound that the king wrote

¹Jahrbuch fuer Israeliten, 1859: Ludwig Philippson, p. 119-120.

to the congregation of Magdeburg disclaiming the intention of excluding the Jews from the army but merely to make military service optional with them. This, however, did not allay the agitation of the German Jews, and as a result the bill was never submitted to parliament. From this time on Philippson stood continually on the watch-tower and nothing escaped his vigilance.

Wherever the honor of the Jew is assailed or his rights threatened we find Ludwig Philippson. Dr. K. Hermann, the editor of the *Koelnische Zeitung*, writes in 1842 that owing to his inferiority, the Jew could not be granted civil rights in a Christian State and forthwith Philippson defiantly hurls the challenge "Facts, Facts, a Kingdom for Facts!" John G. Hoffman, the director of the bureau of statistics, publishes ostensibly a statistical review of the Jews, but in reality an insidious attack upon them and Philippson immediately replies in a scathing article "How the Statistician, Privy Counselor, Dr. John G. Hoffman, has miscalculated." Again, in 1856, Herman Wagener, the editor of the *Kreuzzeitung* and deputy of Neu Stettin, makes a motion in the house of deputies to strike out of article 12 in the laws of January 31, 1850, the clause declaring the enjoyment of civil rights independent of one's religious belief, giving as his reason that this would make Prussia a state without religion and not a Christian state as it actually is. Once more Philippson enters the lists. He calls upon Wagener to show where in the New Testament it says that a Christian state must rob the Jews of rights which the constitution had solemnly and legally granted them. The Jewish soldiers who died in the war with Austria in 1866 are hardly bedded to rest, when Philippson already petitions the ministry and parliament in the name of 300 Jewish congregations that the readiness with which the Jews laid down their lives for the Fatherland should bear witness to the loyalty of the Jew and plead for equal rights.

Philippson had been aptly named "Der alte Ueberall und Nirgends." He is here, there and everywhere. Father Thomas is murdered in Damascus in 1840, and at the instance of the French consul, Ratti-Menton, the charge of ritual murder is brought against the Jews, resulting in the imprisonment and torture of eight of the most representative members of the community. The

German newspapers report the event without a word in exoneration of the Jew. Philippson, filled with indignation, rebukes their silence, exposes the ridiculousness of the accusation and denounces the infamy of the accuser.

In the city of Bologna, in 1856, Edgar Mortara a Jewish child, 6 years old, is kidnapped by the papal guards, his former nurse having confessed to a priest that she had baptized him during his critical illness several years before. Forthwith Philippson secures signatures of 86 German rabbis for an appeal to Pope Pius IX., wherein he is implored to emulate the illustrious Gregory I., "by declaring that every baptism made under compulsion and in secret is invalid and its practice condemned, and thus restore peace to the troubled Jews, give to the world a noble example of justice and love and promote the establishment of good will among men."

Queen Isabella II of Spain is forced to grant a new constitution and the Cortes is summoned to frame one. Philippson memorializes it to make this occasion glorious by making religious liberty a cardinal principle of the new constitution and by revoking the edict of 1492 whereby the Jews were banished from Spain. Though the edict is still unrevoked, Philippson's deed can never be forgotten.

The Crimean war is still in progress. Its issue is uncertain. Yet it is a foregone conclusion that, regardless of the outcome, the Christian inhabitants of the land of the Sultan will be granted full citizenship. There is no such certainty as to the future of the Jews. Promptly Philippson appeals on their behalf, first to the Rothschilds, of Paris and London, then to Lord John Russell and finally to Emperor Napoleon III. While peace negotiations are being carried on by the representatives of the powers convened in Paris, the Sultan decides to grant equal rights to all his subjects regardless of religion, language or race. To what extent the timely intercession of Philippson influenced this action can only be conjectured.

In 1841 he is corresponding with Ouwarow, the Russian minister of education relative to the uplifting of the Russian Jews by establishing schools for them. Alexander II ascends the throne in 1856 with the declaration "Justice to all!" and Phil-

ippson addresses him through the columns of the "Independence Belge," beseeching him not to forget the Jews. The Czar does remember them for a time. The evil days, however, are not long in coming; and it is again Philippson who makes a fervent appeal to the German congregations represented in the convention in Leipzig in 1869 to take steps toward the gradual and organized emigration of the suffering Jews from the western provinces of the Russian Empire and their settlement either in the interior of Russia or other lands. He asks that a commission for that purpose be at once appointed from among those present. His plan meets with universal approval; and a commission of 15 is chosen, with Philippson as chairman.

Deeply moved by the wretchedness of the Jews in the Holy Land, he appeals in 1842 for funds to erect and maintain a Jewish hospital in Jerusalem. And in 1854 he visits the cities of Paris, Strassburg and Hamburg to enlist support for his project of bringing young men from the Orient and educating them in Europe so that they might return and carry the torch of western civilization to their benighted brethren. To Philippson therefore belongs the distinction of having been the path pointer for the Alliance Israélite Universelle. Wherever there is a question of Israel's weal or woe, stands "stets siegreich Ludwig Philippson."

It is the nature of man that he seeks a rational basis for his most unreasonable actions. There never was a Jew-hater who did not give a reason for his hostility. The most absurd charges have been trumped up to give a show of reason for the persecution of the Jew. The one that has been most frequent, because always available, is that the Jews crucified Jesus. When no other weapons forged against him prevailed, when his life was absolutely beyond reproach, here was the one count on which the Jew could always be indicted and invariably condemned. What more natural than that Philippson should have turned to this subject? As a result we have a most brilliant essay "Haben wirklich die Juden Jesum gekreuzigt?" Therein Philippson gives us a summary of the arguments of Salvador and Saalschuetz, as well as his own, in defense of the Jew. Taking up the argument where Saalschuetz in his "Mosaische Recht" introduces the political motive into the trial of

Jesus, Philipppson proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the Romans alone were responsible for his death, for none other than political reasons. The Jews, never reconciled to be subject to Rome, and especially exasperated by the cruel treatment at the hand of the procurator Pontius Pilate, were ready to strike for independence at any moment. The only thing needed was a leader. This spirit of revolt could hardly have escaped the watchful eye of Pilate. When, therefore, Jesus appeared as the Messiah, with a considerable following addressing him as king, Pilate became greatly alarmed and at once took steps to suppress what to him appeared as an uprising. The leader was apprehended and convicted on the charge of high treason, he having admitted to be the king of the Jews. Then to make sport of Jesus as well as his followers Pilate orders the soldiers to dress Jesus in a scarlet robe, place a crown of thorns upon his head and a reed into his hands and after his crucifixion they write over his head the "accusation. This is Jesus the king of the Jews." This ignominious end of the man through whom the Jews had hoped to gain their independence was to serve as a warning for the future. It was not to satisfy, but to crush the independence of the Jews that Pilate orders the crucifixion of their leader. These are the facts deliberately distorted by the gospel writers to please the Romans whom they hoped to convert and to condemn the Jews who had already declined to accept the new faith. This is the substance of Philipppson's answer to the question, "Have the Jews really crucified Jesus?"

Appearing originally in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, in 1865, this essay was soon reprinted in pamphlet form and has been translated into almost every modern language. No one having read it will be surprised to learn of its exceptional popularity. It is very doubtful whether the true story of the crucifixion has ever been told in a style more lucid, with logic more convincing and dignity so becoming. This can be said of all of Philipppson's apologetical as well as polemical writings.

¹Ludwig Philipppson: Haben wirklich die Juden Jesum gekreuzigt? Passim.

THE OUTER EMANCIPATION OF JUDAISM.

In an able article on the civil emancipation of the Jew in Germany, Dr. Ismar Freund says "*Der Weg zur völligen Emanzipation des Juden fñhrt ueber die Emanzipation des Judenthums*"³ No one realized this fact more fully than Ludwig Philippson. As long as Judaism was in bondage the Jew could not be free. Hence he neglected no opportunity to seek the removal of the discriminations against Judaism. In 1842 he petitioned to abolish the oath more Judaico. This oath, when insisted on by the state was a reflection on the Jewish religion as it was an insult to the Jew. It was tantamount to saying that Judaism is indifferent to the violation of an oath by a Jew, unless taken more Judaico. Again, in 1859, he memorialized the ministry to grant the Jewish prisoners the right to observe their religious holidays and allow them to have a service conducted by a Jewish minister and to exempt the Jewish clergy from taxation like the clergy of other denominations. Many more instances could be cited of Philippson's efforts to have Judaism placed on a level with the religions that enjoyed state recognition.

Philippson, however, saw that even the political emancipation of Judaism was not an absolute guarantee for the emancipation of the Jew. The emancipation of the Jew will not be permanently secured until Judaism will have become the religion of humanity. For the Jew will come to his own, only when man will have come to his own and that will be only "when mankind will regard itself as one family, when there will be only one law for all, one right for all, one prosperity for all, one reign of peace for all and one brotherly love for all."⁴ And that will come to pass only when humanity will have become emancipated by Judaism. In his sermon "The Victory of Israel," delivered in 1844, Philippson said: "By the Victory of Israel I do not mean that civic freedom which the nations grant us and would gladly take away, bestow to-day and to-morrow withdraw. That is not the victory of Israel. The victory of Israel is the conquest and mastery which the ideas and teachings of Judaism have gained, are gaining and will continue to gain

³Jahrbuch fuer Jued. Gesch. und Literatur, 1911, p. 138.

⁴Ludwig Philippson: Siloah, 1845, Die Zukunft, pp. 264-272.

over the whole world, over all men and over all nations."¹ The enthronement of Judaism will alone insure the enfranchisement of the Jew.

THE INNER EMANCIPATION OF THE JEW.

(A) *Emancipation of the Rabbi.*

In an article "What must be Emancipated" in the A. Z. d. J., of 1844, Philippson makes it clear that before anything else the rabbi must be emancipated. In the old Talmudic days the rabbi's functions were clearly defined and his education well adapted to meet the demands made upon him. But with the emergence of the Jew from the narrow life of the Shulchan Aruk, the principal duties of the rabbi disappeared. What was he to do to justify his position? True, Zunz had shown in his masterly work "Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden" that preaching in the vernacular was highly commendable, it being not an innovation, but a re-introduction of a vital part of the service in the old synagogue; yet the fact that the regular weekly sermon was the exception, not the rule, and then only the task of the "Prediger" proves that preaching was not regarded as an essentially rabbinical function. And as for religious instruction in the modern sense, that was altogether beneath the dignity of most of the rabbis of that time. Philippson removed all ambiguity as to the importance of both the sermon and school. He speaks of the former as the "Kernpunkt" of the service. "Preaching," he says, "is an essential, regular part of the divine service." "What the religious school is for the child, the sermon is for the adult."² This comparison, coming from Philippson, emphasized as nothing else could the importance of the sermon; for no rabbi thought more of the religious school or has done more for it than Philippson. In a letter of advice regarding the duties of the rabbi, he says "The first and foremost concern of the rabbi is the religious instruction. Down from the proud but hollow pedestal whence he looks disdainfully upon the instruction of the youth, the rabbi who does not put forth his best efforts to organize it, who does not give it his closest attention, and does not regard it

¹Ludwig Philippson: Die Rhetorik und die Jued. Homiletik, passim.

²A. Z. d. J. 1850, p. 182.

strictly as his own domain,—that rabbi is not worthy of being one, and his high-sounding words from the pulpit will be spoken to the winds.”³

Next to knowing what to do, the problem was how to do it. Very few rabbis preached real Jewish sermons, because very few knew what such a sermon was. With some it was nothing more than the old *darasha* in a new garb; with others a colorless moralizing, often a slavish imitation of the discourses of the rationalistic Christian preachers of that time. Philippson insisted that the Jewish sermon was neither one nor the other, nor the combination of both. “Jewish preaching,” he declares, “has a two-fold mission, one to the world at large, and another to the Jew as such. In relation to the former, the sermon must be the means of emphasizing the universalism of the Mosaic or Jewish faith. It must show how all true knowledge of God originated with the Mosaic revelation, how all the conceptions of revelation, faith, God-like living, and the direct intervention of Providence in the lives of individuals and mankind proceeded from the Mosaic religion and its development, and how the people of Israel is destined to be the bearer and the historic witness of the Mosaic revelation. Secondly it must make plain the reasonableness of the Mosaic faith, its capacity to become a religion thoroughly philosophical and in harmony with the highest culture—the religion of humanity, and that the synagogue is destined to carry this religion toward the highest development of mankind. On the other hand, for the Jew the sermon must be the means of explaining the Mosaic religion in its theological as well as moral bearing to him and to show how the essential tendency of the Mosaic faith expressed itself in the ceremonial laws so that through them the Israelite may be preserved for all time in religious and holy living.” From this it necessarily follows that the Jewish sermon is something entirely distinct in content and ought to have its own appropriate form. The material for such a sermon was accessible to all, it being the Bible, Agada and Jewish history. But only very few of the rabbis knew how to use it. Philippson greatly deplored the lack of a text-book on Jewish homiletics and frequently expressed the hope that there

³Ludwig Philippson: *Die Rhetorik und Jued Homiletik*, p. 51 ff.

might soon be established in Germany a school where that branch of knowledge might receive the attention it deserves.

During all this time Philippson did everything to supply the needs of the rabbi. Already, in 1834, he edited the "Israelitisches Predigt und Schul Magazin" the first magazine devoted to the Jewish sermon and religious school. By means of this, model sermons by Philippson, a master of the art as well as the science of Jewish preaching, were brought to the attention of the less gifted rabbi. Soon after the publication of this magazine was suspended, the A. Z. d. J. became the medium of instruction for many a preacher and teacher. Some years later a collection of his sermons was published in three volumes under the title "Siloah." Besides these, many other sermons of Philippson have been preserved in print, some of the best specimens being found in Kayserling's Bibliothek Juedischer Kanzelredner. The principles of Jewish homiletics he set forth in different articles published at various times. These were collected and published by Dr. M. Kayserling in 1890 under the title "Die Rhetorik und Juedische Homiletik." This booklet is of inestimable value to the Jewish preacher. It contains much that every rabbi should know and also some things that the congregation would like him to know, namely, that the sermon should be short, *sinnig* and not *tiefsinnig* and, above all, thoroughly prepared.

To facilitate the work of religious instruction, he wrote two catechisms, one for younger and the other for older children. Not that there was a particular dearth of text-books. Already at that time there was a plethora of Sunday-school literature.¹ But the school not being graded, the text-books lacked progressive treatment in conformity with the gradual mental development of the child. It was this need that Philippson wished to supply by means of these early publications. His principal work for the school, however, is "Die Israelitische Religionslehre." It comprises three parts, which appeared successively in 1861, 1862 and 1864. The first part may be styled "The Evidence for the Existence of God;" the second, "The Theology of Judaism;" the third, "The Ethics of Judaism." The work is in reality a digest of Philippson's re-

¹Zunz: Gottesdienstliche Vortrage, p. 472.

ligious views as set forth in his "Reden wider den Unglauben," "Die Entwicklung der Religiösen Idee im Judenthume, Christenthume und Islam," "Die Religion der Gesellschaft and his "Weltbewegende Fragen." While much of the subject-matter in this book is beyond the comprehension of the pupil and was undoubtedly intended for the teacher, the essential points, given as they are in the form of question and answer substantiated by or derived from accompanying Bible verses, makes the book equally helpful to the less mature pupil.

Beneficial though these and other individual efforts might have been to the individual rabbi, they could hardly have raised the standard of the rabbinate as a whole. The only thing that could emancipate the rabbi was a special training for his vocation. Accordingly, in 1837, Philippson made a stirring appeal for the establishment of a theological faculty and seminary. "Israel," he says, "faces a serious crisis. Israel stands at a turning point in regard to its inner as well as outer being. Our history has reached a point in its existence whence Providence will lead it to its high and holy destiny. It is for us to prove that four thousand years of history have not failed to leave their impression. We must not allow events to take their own course. It is our duty to take an active part and by our own work give direction and impetus to the future. Everything that has thus far been done was by individuals and for individuals. Everything is fragmentary. Our religion is without seats of learning; our congregations without religious leaders; our schools without teachers, and our children without instruction. We need a theological faculty for the preservation and the development of our religion and for the education of our spiritual guides, and a seminary for the training of our teachers."² This call met with a most enthusiastic response. The foremost preachers made it a subject of their Sabbath sermons. Many congregations pledged support, and, for a while it seemed as if this grand idea was to be speedily realized. But the time was not yet ripe. The seed had to sink deeper into the hearts of the people and gather greater strength before it could bear such goodly fruit. Almost eighteen years after this appeal, and no doubt largely as a

²A. Z. d. J. 1837, p. 389 ff.

result of it, the Breslau Seminary was founded. Yet not until 1870, when the Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthums was founded, did Philippson enjoy the full fruition of his labors. It matters little whether the idea of a Jewish theological faculty was a "Geigerscher Gedanke," as Jost maintains, or whether it originally suggested itself to Philippson already in 1835 "Ganz unabhaengig von Geiger," as Kayserling insists,¹ Philippson first brought this great need to the attention of the people, and in a manner that compelled serious consideration. It was therefore eminently fit that, on the opening of the Hochschule on May 6, 1872, Philippson should have the honor of delivering the dedicatory address. It is needless to say that Philippson rose to the height of the occasion.

The same desire to increase the efficiency of the rabbinate impelled Philippson to issue a call for a rabbinical conference in 1844, the thought having been suggested to him by Dr. Max Lillienthal, of Petersburg, in 1843.² The German rabbinate was without organization, and there being no union, there could hardly be much strength. And was there ever a time when individualism was a greater menace to the cause of Israel in Germany? In his appeal to the rabbis to organize Philippson says, "At a time when Judaism is threatened both within and without, individualism is little short of treason. The religious life of Israel is daily growing weaker and the layman asks us, 'what are you doing?' My brethren, the interests of Israel, the interests of revealed religion entrusted to us, the interests of the One God are at stake. Woe to the slothful servant who eats the bread of the priest and neglects the sacrifices of the Lord."³ The objects of the conference, according to this appeal, were to be (1) the promotion of a better acquaintance and to foster close relations among the members; (2) to stimulate each other in the conduct of their office; (3) to undertake communal works and institutions; (4), to deliberate together on all Jewish affairs—obviously all practical considerations. That Geiger was in full accord with Philippson as to the aims of the

¹M. Kayserling: Ludwig Philippson, p. 64.

²A. Z. d. J. 1844, p. 117.

³A. Z. D. J. p. 26-27.

conference can be seen from his letter expressing his regret at his inability to be present at the opening of the conference. In this he explicitly states: "Die Versammlung sei eine praktische, keine theoretische."⁴ When, therefore, the critical spirit asserted itself at the very opening of the Brunswick conference, it was very natural that Philippson should be disappointed. The main purpose of calling the conference was to bring about union in the ranks of the German rabbinate, while to dwell on vital differences, from the very start, was to destroy it as a unifying agency. Nevertheless, and be it said to the credit of Philippson, he continued to work with the same zeal for all the future conferences. To him belongs the honor of being the foster parent of the modern rabbinical conference idea.

(B) *Emancipation of the Laity.*

Concurrent with his efforts for the emancipation of the rabbi were his projects for the emancipation of the laity. In 1844 he said "The emancipation cannot and may not be limited to the political status of the Jew and the lifting of the masses out of their degraded social condition. Another emancipation is needed for the upper class in Jewry. In a word, they must be brought back to Judaism."⁵ The appalling indifference to, if not downright contempt for, Judaism on the part of the educated Jew meant a loss of much valuable timber so sadly needed for the upbuilding of the house of Israel that had fallen. Besides, Israel's enemies saw in this defection an admission of the inferiority of Judaism. Of course, this conclusion was false. It was not Judaism, but positive religion that was rejected by the worshippers of reason. For this class of Jews Philippson wrote his "Reden wider den Unglauben." Therein he pointed out that, far from being unworthy of serious thought, religion is the highest reason, that nature with its inexorable laws, society with its law of mutuality and love and history with its law of continuity can be understood only when

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1844, p. 337-339.

⁵A. Z. d. J. 1844, p. 86 ff.

read in terms of God as conceived by the religion of Moses.¹ "Conviction," he says, "must return to the mind of the Jew and a feeling of pride must be awakened within him that into his hands is entrusted the mission of Israel. Assuredly the belief in God as taught by Israel cannot be shaken by sophistry, nor will sophistry save or defend it. It is the expression of the universal heart and mind. Yet it must be acquired and continually extended by the individual. And how? Through reading and searching the Sacred Scriptures, the knowledge of Jewish history, the appreciation of the divine creation to which the Bible so often refers and the contemplation of the noble men of our own and other nations."² In common with all the great reformers, Philippson realized that the salvation of Judaism lies in the "*Wissenschaft des Judenthums*," with this difference that, whereas to them "*Wissenschaft des Judenthums*" meant Jewish Science, to him it stood for a popular knowledge of Israel's scriptures and history.

Unless the Jew had a knowledge of the Bible he could not be convinced of the sublime truth of Judaism and unless he read the history of the Jew he could not feel proud of being one. To stimulate him in the study of both they had to be presented to him in a language he could understand and a style he would admire. Hence we have Philippson the translator of the Bible and the writer of Jewish historical novels.

At the time Philippson undertook to translate the Bible there were already many other good German translations, some popular and some scientific. The superiority of Philippson's Bible consisted in its being the first to give a complete running German commentary of the entire scripture from a Jewish standpoint. It was also first to be supplied with the finest English engravings, and the first in which text, translations, illustration and commentary were combined. This was a tremendous undertaking and it required eighteen years to complete it. The order in which the books appeared is as follows: The Former Prophets, in 1841, The Five Books of Moses, 1844, Later Prophets, 1848, and the Sacred Writings in 1854. When the whole work was finished it was issued

¹Ludwig Philippson: *Reden wider den Unglauben*, passim.

²Ibid: p. 128.

in three large volumes. Already, in 1858, there appeared a new edition of the whole work and, besides the publication of several parts with or without the text, a third complete edition was issued in 1862.

What chiefly interests the Bible student in Philippson's Biblical work is the commentary. In this the author has made judicious use of the Talmud, Midrash and the other Jewish as well as non-Jewish commentators from the earliest times down to his own day. He makes frequent reference to the discoveries in the field of archæology, and never fails to call attention to the fact that they invariably confirm the Biblical narratives. Much light is shed on many a Biblical institution by acquainting the reader with the life and habits of the nations who lived about ancient Israel. As a higher critic Philippson neither could nor would have cared to establish his claim. He holds to the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. "The five books," he says, "are one product of the Mosaic time." This is proven by the unity of form, content and spirit. The contention of the higher critics that the book of Deuteronomy was written in the days of Josiah he regards as entirely unwarranted and simply proves "the ill will and shallowness of the critics."³ According to him the Torah as it left the hand of Moses ends with Deut. 31:23; Chapters 32 and 33 as far as verse 5, though written by Moses, were embodied in the Bible by a later editor who was also the author of the last eight verses of the book.⁴ Unlike the critics who, more for the sake of cleverness, than clearness, twist and turn the Bible text, Philippson had too much reverence to change it. He lets the Bible itself explain the Bible language. Whatever may be the deficiencies of this commentary, it is certainly very illuminating.

Philippson's Bible brought him marked recognition, the most noteworthy being a costly jewel from Czar Alexander II. For us its chief merit lies in the fact that thereby the Torah became a family Bible for the German Jew.

To spread the knowledge of the Bible it was necessary that the purchase price of the book be within the reach of every one.

³Ludwig Philippson: Bible. Introduction to Pentateuch, Ed. 1845.

⁴Ludwig Philippson: Bible, Deut. p. 993.

Philippson appealed to the German Jews to establish a Bible society. This had become especially urgent, because the missionaries, hoping to make converts by distributing their Bibles, sold them at a nominal cost. Philippson's project called forth considerable opposition. Nevertheless the society was organized in November, 1860, under the leadership of Rabbi W. Landau, of Dresden, Prof. S. J. Kaempf, of Prague, and Ludwig Philippson. In 1862 the Pentateuch was finished in German as well as Hebrew and the entire Bible in Hebrew, while a year later the translation also was completed. By 1866 over three hundred thousand Bibles had found their way into Jewish homes.

Between the Bible times and the modern age lay centuries of Jewish history which were little known and less appreciated. Dazzled by the modern culture into which he had suddenly been admitted, the Jew was ashamed of his past. For that reason it was essential that he should become thoroughly acquainted with his history. But history can be most fascinatingly told in a historical novel. Thus Philippson became a novelist. One can see at a glance that this motive animated him in his belletristic activity. Beginning with this tragedy "Joachim," in which he describes the fall of the Temple down to the story "Der Freiheitskämpfer," a picture of the German Jew at the time of the Napoleonic wars, there is not a period in the vicissitudinous life of the Jew he did not portray either in prose or poetry. His object is not merely to supply historic information, but rather to fire the imagination of his reader, to kindle within him an admiration for his people so that he might deem it a privilege to claim kinship with them. Israel's life story is not a tragedy but a grand epic, with the Jew as the hero. Whether it is Rabbah in his wretched hovel in Pumbedita or Jacob Tirado, the friend and confidant of William of Orange, Ben Joseph proffering aid to the King of Poland, or Daniel Battersdorf fighting against Napoleon in the Battle of Leipzig—it is always as the finest type of manhood that the Jew is pictured. As in the Torah the modern Jew was to find the highest wisdom, so in Jewish history he was to meet the noblest men and women. By the side of the family Bible was to stand the family tree.

Philipppson's novels, stories and poems, written at various times, appeared first in the *A. Z. d. J.* and were subsequently collected and published under the title *Saron*, growing from one volume in 1843 to six in 1870. From a literary standpoint, "*Jacob Tirado*," is the best of his historical novels. It is a thrilling story of the revolt of Holland against Spain with Jacob Tirado, a Marano, as the hero. In this book the writer has given us a vivid description of the stormy life and the mental struggles of the Maranos. Among his dramatic works, "*Esterka*" is the best known and most meritorious. It is a five-act play picturing the tragic life of the Jews in Poland about the middle of the fourteenth century. Besides enjoying great popularity in Germany, many of his works, translated into Hebrew, were eagerly read by the Jews in Russia.

In order to bring Jewish literature out of the closets and libraries Philipppson called on all the German-reading Israelites in 1854 to found a Jewish publication society. This was but a renewed attempt of one he had made in vain in 1843. This time, however, his effort was successful. Even Geiger, while saying "it is too bad that it had to be left to Philipppson to call such a society into existence,"¹ did not hesitate to have three of his works published by it. The society was established on May 1st, 1855, with Jost, Jellinek, and Philipppson as the managing board. Within two years after its foundation it had a membership of four thousand. In the eighteen years of its existence it issued eighty works covering Jewish science, history, poetry, fiction and biography. Thanks to Philipppson, the Jew could now read of his noble past and receive inspiration for a still nobler future.

THE CONGREGATION.

With a rabbinate and laity such as Philipppson sought to create, the material as well as spiritual interests of the congregation would have been amply safeguarded. The former, however, was still a far off hope, and in the meantime the latter was languishing. But for the law that "unless a Jew renounced his faith and until he became a member of another church he had to contribute to the congregation of the district where he resided," many a one would have

¹A. Geiger: *Nachgelassene Schriften*, Vol. 5, p. 79.

withdrawn from the congregation. When, therefore, in 1873, the German parliament considered whether the Prussian law of 1847 should substantially be adopted as the law for the entire monarchy¹ or whether Lasker's resolution, making it possible for a Jew to resign from his congregation "aus confessionellen Bedenken," without at the same time renouncing his Judaism, should take its place,² the material interests of the congregation were trembling in the balance. Lasker, the spokesman of the orthodox party, insisted that when the Christian resigns from his parish he leaves only his church, but does not cease to be a Christian. Why, then, should a Jew in resigning from his religious society be compelled to renounce Judaism? Samson Raphael Hirsch in his petition to parliament declared "before God, the God of Truth, that the differences between the various denominations in Christianity were not more thorough-going than those between the orthodox and the reformed Jews." Philippson, championing the cause of the congregation, pleaded for the rejection of Lasker's resolution. In July of the same year he addressed a petition to Dr. Falk, the minister of education, wherein he dwelt at length on the incalculable harm that would result to the congregation if a member could resign by simply declaring before a magistrate that he does so from religious scruples. "If," he says, "there are any members who desire a form of service different from the congregation's, the latter would not only permit it, but even contribute toward its maintenance out of its treasury the amount of their membership fee."³ He also addressed an open letter to Lasker, pointing out the fallacy of his reasoning and at the same time maintaining the justice of his own claims. Yet, notwithstanding the many petitions from congregations, both large and small, against Lasker's resolution, it was incorporated in the proposed law. Philippson's timely intervention, however, was not without effect. When, in 1876, the law was finally passed the provisions relating to the financial side of this matter were such that the congregation did not seriously suffer.

¹A. Z. d. J. 1873, p. 53-54.

²A. Z. d. J. 1873, p. 219-222.

³A. Z. d. J. 1873, p. 531-533.

Just as the rabbinate, so the congregations in Germany lacked union. The only time they united was when some great danger threatened. That passed, the centrifugal forces again asserted themselves. This condition Philipppson endeavored to remedy. In August, 1847, he addressed himself to the congregations of Prussia, notably those in the province of Saxony, advising them to form a provincial union of congregations. Failing in this, he again called on the Prussian congregations in 1848 to organize a union of Prussian Jewish congregations. "Congregations of Jeshurun," he pleads, "you have often honored me with your confidence and co-operation. Then it concerned your outer welfare. This time it concerns the inner growth, the salvation, the preservation and the blossoming anew of our faith."⁴ Despite this fervent appeal his advice was not heeded. He continued to hold the union idea before German Jewry until 1869, when the Union of German Jewish Congregations was organized. With the eye of a statesman Philipppson saw that no idea can long survive or spread unless it is embodied in an institution. The congregation is the institution par excellence of Judaism. In the United Congregation of Israel the religious idea was to be preserved and developed for the salvation of the Jew and all mankind. For "of all religions Judaism is the religion of the future. It is the Messiah."⁵

JUDAISM THE UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

The declaration that Judaism, the pariah of religions, is the only one that can save humanity must have been more amusing than exasperating to the German non-Jew. On the one hand there were the materialists and atheists ably represented by David Friedrich Strauss. They regarded all religion as antiquated. On the other hand, there was the church which claimed that it alone could save the world. Against both Philipppson defended his thesis with masterly skill. The worshippers of reason claimed that religion was the child of fear, hunger and thirst, the feeling of dependence, and that, therefore, it belongs to the child age of humanity. It had to give way as soon as reason asserted its sovereignty. In contra-

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1848, p. 742-743.

⁵Ludwig Philipppson: Siloah 1845, Die Zukunft.

diction to this theory Philipppson says "We see that every religion and mythology begins with the question: how and by what means did the things we see in the world come into existence? The origin of religion is not fear, terror and dependence, but the inner law of the human mind to search for the causes of all things about it, to understand and picture them to itself. We see this process repeating itself in every human being with the first awakening of consciousness. How then can it be denied that this natural longing for knowledge is just as truly the source of religion as the feeling of dependence? Nor is it less known to every one that the entire nature of man is based on physical and intellectual development. That this development must be very great is evident from the fact that no creature is so weak and helpless as a new born child. Now underlying the need of development is necessarily the yearning after the ever higher which impels man, at first unconsciously, and later with full consciousness from step to step. He must develop his strength. By his whole nature, therefore, he is directed onward and upward. Thus he is lifted above himself and feels himself in association with a higher being with which he perceives himself to be like. This natural, not artificial, longing, after the higher, this consciousness of a higher nature within himself is just as deep a root of religion. By no means, therefore, should the origin of religion be sought in man's feeling of dependence alone. The latter unites with the impulse to know, the yearning, perception and knowledge of something higher to make the conception of God necessary and to render it inseparable from man's entire intellectual being. As a matter of fact, fear and terror are not the first nor the predominant human emotions; recklessness, self-assurance and courage both precede and predominate." "The belief in God belongs to universal humanity. The individual may discard, detract from or deny it altogether, but he need not imagine that he has robbed mankind of it or that his individual conclusions have established its worthlessness."

¹Ludwig Philipppson: *Gegen David Freiderich Strauss' Der Alte und der neue Glaube*, p. 14 ff.

Religion is here justified by Philippson on the ground of psychology. Inasmuch as psychically man is not merely intellectual or emotional or imaginative, but all these combined, the religion which takes full account of these three elements is the religion that cannot be undermined or overthrown by rationalism. Such a religion is Judaism. David Friedrich Strauss may have demolished Christianity, but he has not weakened Judaism in the least.²

Philippson also proves that, from the standpoint of applied religion, Judaism is the only saving faith. In the three works "Die Entwicklung der religioesen Idee in Judenthume, Christenthume und Islam," "Die Religion der Gesellschaft" and the "Weltbewegende Fragen in Politik und Religion" Philippson develops philosophically the proposition that Judaism is the only religion of society. In his *Weltbewegende Fragen* he says, "The statement that religion and society must be kept apart is false. On the contrary, religion and society must interpenetrate and assimilate each other organically. This is the ideal. We can not make pure metaphysics of morals and view man from the far off distance and perpetually declare "This should," "This might," "Thou shalt," "Thou must." Nor can we make life a purely materialistic, self-determining drift, which rushes down the stream without a basic principle and without aim. It must be penetrated with the principle of the divine as the body is by nerve fluids. Religion and society can not attain to any goal if they do not coalesce. Christianity said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Thereby it banished the soul of religion from society. But inasmuch as religion must have its kingdom in this world, since otherwise how could man be prepared for the next, Christianity has therefore produced on the one hand ascetics and on the other a priestly class which put the Church in the place of religion. By doing this Christianity again fell away from Judaism. And it will be a sad awakening when some day it realizes what a great mistake it made also in this departure from the mother religion. "In the Mosaic institution, however, there is an organic union of religion and society. There we find a perfect interpretation of religion—the divine, and

²Ibid. pp. 5-9.

society—the human elements. We have here, therefore, the ideal of human society.”³

The creed of religion of Society is thus set forth in the Religion der Gesellschaft:

1. Society is not merely a union of men for the mutual satisfaction of their needs by means of exchange of their material or cultural products, but an institution planted by God himself in man's nature and established and guided by Providence so that in it man may live, be educated, uplifted and led to perfection. Not only man as an individual, but society itself is the work of God.

2. The social life constitutes the essential, divine element of the human being by the side of which individuality, self, the egoism of the individual must be regarded of an inferior nature.

3. The brotherly equality of man, a religious duty as relating to individuals, is also the only true foundation of society, and must be the basis of all social relations.

4. Distinctions in society are to be determined only by the inner capacity of the individual as endowed by God and developed by himself.

5. Each individual must have equal freedom to develop and to realize his social personality.”

“The only religion that could evolve these principles is Judaism. Because Judaism was destined to be the religion of the whole real life of man, it embraces, (1) religious knowledge. (2) The moral life of the individual. (3) Man's life in society. These three essential facts were expressed in certain Mosaic institutions to suit the national life of Israel. When divested of the distinctively national elements, they represent the following universal principles: religious knowledge; there is but one God, incorporeal and to be worshipped only in spirit; the moral life of individuals, “Holy shalt thou be,” and “love thy neighbor as thyself;” the social life of man; one law and one right for all. “Judaism posits as the basis of all life there is but one God and there shall be but one man, one in his moral individuality as the result of his

³Ludwig Philippson: *Weltbewegende Fragen, Politik, Staat und Religion*, pp. 84-85.

¹Ludwig Philippson: *Die Religion der Gesellschaft*, pp. 18-36.

holiness and brotherly love, one in his social relation by means of perfect equality."²

The difference between the social ideal of Judaism and that of the pagan religions is inherent in their conceptions of God. The pagan religions started with man and made God in man's image. Mosaism, however, begins with God and makes man in God's image. Seeing in man and the world a variety of relations and conditions, such as life and death, being and not being, and seeking to account for these phenomena, the pagans conceived as many divine authors as corresponded to these appearances. There being no unity in heaven, there could be no unity on earth. The pagan idea is, therefore, properly designated by Philippson as the human idea. It stands for the selfish, individualistic and egoistic view of life. None of the pagan faiths or those in which there is any element of paganism could therefore become the religion of society. In contrast to the human idea stands Mosaism with its religious idea. Mosaism declares at the outset there is a God and from Him it proceeds to man and the world. God is. This is not a deduction from man and the world about him. It is the result of revelation. No plurality could possibly enter into this conception. God is absolute unity. Man is made in His image and is ever striving to become more and more like unto Him. Hence Judaism regards man in all his various relations as a unit. Society to be perfect must also be a unit, for then alone can there be perfect equality and freedom. Judaism, therefore, is the only religion of society.

The essence of the religious idea which Mosaism gave to the world and which has since then been conquering mankind in spite of continuous opposition, Philippson states thus: "The unity of God, the unity of man, the unity of the world; the relation of God to the world through the mediation of the laws of nature; the immediate relation of God to man through Providence, Judgment and Revelation."³

This religious idea is to be borne by Israel for the salvation of mankind. Judaism must continue alongside of Christianity, Is-

²Ludwig Philippson: *Weltbewegende Fragen, Politik*, p. 92.

³Ludwig Philippson: *Entwicklung der rel. Idee im Jud. Christ. und Islam, passim*.

lam, or any other religion or philosophy, till the human or pagan idea will have been completely overcome by the religious idea and the latter will be realized in the life of humanity. As the bearer of the religious idea, Israel has passed through the following four stages: Mosaism, Prophetism, Talmudism, and the Judaism of modern times. In Mosaism the religious idea and religious life were in perfect accord. Prophetism separated the religious idea from the life because, owing to the pagan element in Israel itself, the latter threatened the existence of the Religious idea. On the other hand Talmudism accentuated the religious life. The dispersion and the many hardships Israel had to endure had weakened the spirit, and it was necessary that the life be made such as to preserve the religious idea. But when rabbinism in its zeal to save the idea surrounded it with so many ceremonial laws that they almost smothered it, then its *raison d'être* disappeared. With the first rays of freedom's dawn that penetrated the isolated life of Israel, the religious idea began to re-assert itself. This struggle to free the religious idea from the bondage of Talmudic legalism and ceremonialism and to restore it to its original purity is the task of Judaism in modern times. This latest phase of Judaism is as legitimate and providential as Prophetism and Talmudism. It is a progressive step in the march of the religious idea on its world-conquering mission.²

PHILIPPSON THE REFORMER.

This brings us to the consideration of Philippson's place in Reform Judaism. In his own time that place was very uncertain. The orthodox saw in him a reformer, while the extreme reformer saw in him an orthodox. His views found as little favor with Geiger as with Samson Raphael Hirsch. His moderation was as offensive to the former as his modernism to the latter. On the other hand, Philippson denounced the hypocrisy of neo-orthodoxy and deprecated the unreasonable reasoning of the radical.

That Philippson was a reformer is unquestionable. He was recognized as such by most of his contemporaries. The Berlin Reform Congregation invited him to preach the sermons at their

²Ibid. *passim*.

first services on the New Year's day and Day of Atonement of 1845. His theological writings are everywhere permeated by the spirit of reform. His own positive statements on the subject leave absolutely no room for doubt as to his attitude to reform. In 1845 he said, "We have devoted ourselves to and have acquired the culture which mankind has developed during the course of thousands of years, but Judaism has preserved its eternal and divine content in forms, most of which being the outcome of temporary conditions, have lived their day. This exterior must be refashioned, this form must be changed if Judaism is to continue to influence the lives of its followers in accordance with its purpose and its power, and if it is to persist among the world forces in a manner worthy of its high destiny."³ Again, in 1848, he declared, "Reform is demanded not for outer considerations; it is pressing, it is urgent, it is peremptory, it is the highest necessity from within. The very existence of our religion is involved. We can see no future for it, if it does not sincerely and wholly throw itself into the arms of reform."⁴

There has been a tendency to underestimate Philippon in the philosophy of Reform Judaism. Thus his disapproval of the Brunswick Conference has been accounted for on the ground of his having been of a practical turn of mind and, therefore, out of sympathy with the critical spirit manifested in the conference. To some extent this was undoubtedly true. Yet to imagine that this was the only reason for his opposition, as one might infer even from Dr. David Philipson's admirable work "The Reform Movement in Judaism,"⁵ would be a great mistake. For once at least Philippon was more scientific than the scientists. While the extreme reform party, the party of logic, as Philippon styles it, had only the idea of positive religion in view and insisted that only cold reason shall determine what is to be retained in Judaism, Philippon maintained that the emotions and the imagination are integral parts of man's spiritual nature and must not be neglected. Those institutions in Judaism which still appeal to the heart as well as the

³A. Z. d. J. 1844, p. 387.

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1848, p. 326.

⁵David Philipson: The Reform Movement in Judaism, pp. 220-221.

mind of the Jew may not be summarily discarded. Time has proven that Philippson was right. Our own American reform, though at first tending toward the position of Geiger, has of late years been following, in principle at least, in the direction of Philippson; and a decided deepening of the Jewish consciousness is everywhere noticeable.

Martin Philippson says "The original founder and leader of the party of historical reform in Germany was Ludwig Philippson."² In his articles on reform Judaism the latter says, "Neither Mosaism nor Talmudism is in itself the real Judaism. The real Judaism is the historical Judaism which, guided by Providence, has pursued and will continue to pursue the great path of development."³ Herein we have a protest against the Mosaists who would confine Judaism to Mosaism and against those who believe that the Talmud is the last word of Judaism. In 1854 Philippson says, "History is nothing else but development. A standstill neither is nor has a history. If there were no development there would be no history. Accordingly history justifies the newly self-developing and the newly developed. Each has the approval of history because either it has already become or is just becoming, historical."⁴ When, therefore, he says that real Judaism is historical Judaism, he maintains the legitimacy of reform. A defense, it is also a definition of reform. Reform Judaism, according to this, must be but a link in the chain of historical Judaism. History implies continuity. Disregarding the past, reform Judaism ceases to be real Judaism, since it is no longer historical Judaism.

It has already been pointed out that Philippson did not approve the reforms proposed in the Brunswick Conference. One of the reasons was that they were not psychological. Besides, there was a tendency to ignore the past which according to Philippson's conception of Judaism, was inadmissible. Above all, however, Philippson insisted that the Jewish Reformation came from within, and was not something imposed upon Israel from without. For

²Martin Philippson: *Neueste Gesch. des Jud. Volkes*, p. 186.

³A. Z. d. J. 1862, p. 501.

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1850, p. 17.

that reason "it is the body of Israel that should express itself concerning the content of Judaism as it lives in the consciousness of its followers to-day."⁵ If any radical changes are to be made it is not the rabbinate alone, but the whole of Israel that is to make them. For these reasons he was so urgent in his advocacy of a Synod already as early as 1848. Over twenty years elapsed before his hope was realized in the Synod of Leipzig, in 1869, in which he was a conspicuous figure and an important factor.

As for being a practical reformer, Philipppson must rest his claim on his attitude to the Oriental synagogue. He favored the organ, choir and prayers in the vernacular, his own liturgy, published in 1864, containing as many German as Hebrew prayers. In the Brelau Conference, in 1846, he voted to abolish the last day of Passover and Simhat Torah, the latter being unnecessary since Shabout is now celebrated as the feast of rejoicing over the Torah. While he was opposed to eliminating from the prayers the hope of the coming of the Messiah, he did not regard the belief in a personal Messiah essential. What was fundamental in the Jewish faith is the Messianic idea. Of this he says "As Revelation is the foundation, so the Messianic idea is the roof of Judaism." Though he retained the prayer for the return to Jerusalem, he neither yearned for nor believed in the ultimate restoration of Zion. In a sermon on the 9th of Ab., 1842, he says, "We are no longer confined in the limits of a small land. We belong to the whole world. We have the word of God no longer for ourselves alone, but to give it to and bear witness to it before all the nations. For that purpose Jerusalem fell, for that purpose we have been dispersed." To him "Jerusalem" is only a figure of speech. "We still have our Jerusalem, our Temple; its form is broken, but its spirit has survived." Though in his liturgy he retains the prayers for the re-establishment of the sacrificial cult, he did not intend it either to be taken literally since he explicitly says, "In the Messianic era the ceremonial laws will no longer be binding, as the midrash tells us, *leatid laba kol hakarbanot betelin*."⁶

⁵A. Z. d. J. 1848, p. 47.

⁶Ludwig Philipppson: Predigt gehalten am Tage der Zerstörung Jerus. 9 Ab. 1843.

To the following innovations Philipppson offered vigorous opposition. Regarding the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday he says, "All history declares against the transfer of the Sabbath. The other faiths (Christianity and Islam) have taken the Sabbath from us, yet, not wishing to have anything in common with us, they purposely transferred it to Sunday and Friday respectively. They did this not because ours is not the right one, but to emphasize their independence of us, and shall Judaism now surrender its independence and shall we go and say, we wish to celebrate the day you celebrated?"¹ And again, "Can Judaism so completely deny its entire history by rejecting this holy institution for the sake of wordly considerations? Shall we give up the seventh day Sabbath which Scripture, tradition and even the history of the nations regard as the day to be observed?"² The fact that Philipppson favored Sunday for the benefit of those who could not possibly attend on the Sabbath is no indication of inconsistency on his part. Even from a strictly orthodox standpoint there is no objection to Sunday service.

Contrary to the unanimous opinion of the Augsburg Synod which declared the boy born of a Jewish mother must be considered a Jew even though he was not circumcised for any reason whatsoever, Philipppson held that "whosoever rejects circumcision out of stubbornness, has broken away from historical Judaism because in common with Biblical and Talmudic Judaism it has always regarded circumcision the seal of the covenant."³

As to the retention of the Hebrew in the liturgy, this question the Brunswick conference referred to a commission. The majority expressed itself against it for the following reasons: firstly, Hebrew is not understood by the worshipper and the prayer must, therefore, be meaningless, and, secondly, it is a dead language. Since its extinction our minds have expanded and our circle of ideas has become enlarged, hence it is not suited to the expression of our true self. These arguments Philipppson meets by saying: "Prayer is not a thing of the understanding, but much more

¹A. Z. d. J. 1846, p. 445.

²A. Z. d. J. 1846, p. 503.

³A. Z. d. J. 1870, p. 437.

of the emotions, and, since so many sacred associations cluster about the Hebrew, it being the language of revelation,⁴ the language of our historic past and the language which is the one bond that unites us as a religious body, it can not but appeal to our emotions. Secondly, in the Jewish divine service prayer is not only the expression of the feelings, but the essential part thereof is a declaration of the religious content of Judaism both dogmatically and historically. That is another reason for its retention.⁴ The force of the first reason will be readily admitted. Prayer is an act of emotion and the Hebrew does appeal to the emotions of the Jew. But one fails to see the cogency of the second reason advanced by Philippson. If the Jew does not understand the Hebrew, then the declaration of his faith in that language can be of very little religious value either to him subjectively or to Judaism objectively. As to Geiger's criticism of Philippson because of his insistence on retaining the Hebrew in the service, while he himself preached at a service conducted exclusively in German on the holiest day, referring of course to the Berlin Reform Gemeinde,⁵ that it is quite specious.

Relative to intermarriage, Philippson's views underwent a decided change between the Brunswick Conference, in 1844, and 1864, when he published the third part of his *Religionslehre*. At the conference it was Philippson who introduced the resolution "The intermarriage of Jews and Christians and, in general the intermarriage of Jews with adherents of any of the monotheistic religions is not forbidden, provided that parents are permitted by the laws of the State to bring up the offspring out of such mixed marriage in the Jewish faith."⁶ In his *Religionslehre*, however, he says, "Religion must pronounce against mixed marriages. It has been said that such marriages will contribute toward the promotion of tolerance and bring the different religions closer to each other. On the other hand, it must be conceded that they contribute just as much toward the weakening of religiousness and sincerity in matters of faith. It is certainly the duty of

⁴A. Z. d. J. 1844, Nos. 33, 43, 45, and 52.

⁵A. Geiger: *Nachgel. Schriften*, Vol. 5, p. 194.

⁶A. Z. d. J. 1844, p. 374.

mankind to extend the reign of tolerance among all classes and in individuals, however widely they may differ from each other; but this must not be done if it involves a leveling of the religious ground. Therefore, little as any sincere friend of religion and humanity could wish that religion should stand between the persons who sincerely love each other, deeply as it may grieve him to cause such persons pain, yet from the standpoint of religion and sincere religious life he must disapprove of mixed marriages."¹

Notwithstanding his opposition to these proposed reforms, Philipppson was nevertheless a Reformer. Yet it was "not reform, but re-birth that was his watchword."² Rabbi Dr. Rahmer has thus summed up the life work of this great man: "There was no one in Germany who, like him, carried the torch of Jewish thought into all circles, no one who was so undaunted and indefatigable in raising his voice for the Jew and Judaism. Untold numbers of his co-religionists were led by and through him from the wilderness of superstition and formalism into the land of faith; at the same time, being a poet, he had a deep appreciation of the soulful and sincere in the old Jewish life."³ Ludwig Philipppson has been bracketed with Moses Mendelssohn. At first blush, this comparison may appear superficial; but when we think of Philipppson's translation of the Bible, his fondness for and felicitous use of the Socratic method, his "Religion der gesellschaft" and "Politik" in purpose and spirit not unlike Mendelssohn's "Jerusalem," then we realize how strikingly these two sons of Dessau resemble each other. Turning our eyes to our own shores, the name of Isaac Leeser, that stalwart pioneer of American Judaism, occurs to us as one to whom Philipppson might be compared. But when we think of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* with its motto, "Light and Right for Humanity," Philipppson's efforts to organize a Union of German Jewish Congregations, his creation of the Conference of German Rabbis, his fervent appeals for the establishment of a Jewish Theological Seminary as the only salvation of Judaism in Ger-

¹Ludwig Philipppson: *Israelitische Religionslehre*. Part). p. 251.

²Jahrduch fuer Jued. Geschichte, 1911, p. 2.

³Ibid. p. 3.

many, and furthermore when we contemplate Philipppson the man of tireless activity and wonderful resourcefulness, the doughty champion of justice and truth, the eloquent preacher of Judaism with profound reverence for its past and high hopes for its future, the leader with matchless tact and grace, then there comes to our mind the name of one whose spirit is an abiding benediction in our midst—the name of Isaac M. Wise.

Philipppson and Wise were kindred, nay, twin spirits, the two greatest organizing geniuses of Judaism in the nineteenth century. They were pre-eminently constructive and for that very reason conservative. They were the master-builders in Judaism, having laid their foundation deep in the hearts of their people: and for that reason their work will survive. Both have built for themselves an everlasting monument in the grateful hearts of united Israel.

C-2 •

DISCUSSION OF RABBI KORNFELD'S PAPER ON "LUDWIG PHILIPPSON."

BY RABBI MENDEL SILBER, Albuquerque, N. M.

Unconsciously and unintentionally the biographer, as a rule, magnifies his hero. In gathering the material on the subject the author acquires quite a natural love for his man, which love then covers "a multitude of sins." I fear that Rabbi Kornfeld is no exception to the rule. He, too, seems to have shown some partiality to the work and worth of the man whose life he reviewed. My list of grievances is, however, not a long one. The paper is excellent in many respects, and contains a vast amount of data which will prove an invaluable contribution to Jewish literature in the English language. Where I disagree with the writer of the paper is in the statement that Philippson was the first to introduce the regular weekly sermon into Prussia. He was not the first one to introduce the sermon, but he was merely the first one to re-introduce it. Sermons had been preached weekly, and on special occasions long before that. But, in 1823, this had been prohibited by the government when the Jacobsen Temple had been closed. In 1832 Philippson preached a sermon again in the vernacular and thereby helped to make the prohibition against preaching a dead letter. This is all that is claimed by Phœbus Philippson in his *Biographische Skizzen*, (Vol. 2, p. 57).

As to the statement that Philippson was never vindictive, that his writings were always marked by grace and amenity, I am not quite sure that this can be substantiated by the facts. He dared, for instance, to throw stones at the bier of Geiger in violation, surely, of the Talmudic maxim, "hostile words are not to be spoken at the bier of learned men." He also spoke in very undignified terms of Moritz Steinschneider, and the gentle Leopold

Stein. Another thing that may be pointed out is the fact that the objections raised to Philipppson's Bible translation had a deeper significance than the one the writer of the paper seems inclined to attribute to them. The objections were based upon the feeling that if the Bible were translated into a secular language the original would thereby lose, and the knowledge of Hebrew decrease. This same objection had been raised also to Mendelssohn's translation.

What was not adequately explained in the paper were the many seeming inconsistencies on the part of Philipppson. To understand this, we must remember that reform Judaism in his time was still in a transitional period. There were those who claimed that all the Jew should stand by is the Torah, while others wished to include also tradition as a part of modern Judaism. And then there was the third class, the so-called neo-orthodox, headed by Samson Raphael Hirsch, and Michael Sachs. Philipppson at times sided with the one, and at other times sided with the other. If we remember that he was what we may term a practical reformer, and that expediency often played an important part in his attitude towards certain questions, we will understand this vacillating position.

Two points that were omitted in the paper which I think are of sufficient historical value to include therein, may be mentioned in conclusion. The one is that at one time he went to Belgium, and was instrumental in having an article in behalf of the Russian Jew published in the *Independence Belge*, and that this article made such a strong impression upon the reading public that it was subsequently republished in the principal Journals of Europe.

The second point I should like to see incorporated in this excellent account of Philipppson's work is that he was awarded a gold medal by the Czar of Russia for his illustrated Bible. This seems to me significant from the fact that the awarder of the medal was the Czar of Russia, and the recipient of it was a Jew.

I have no further time to discuss the analysis of Philipppson's position in the reform movement as presented in the paper, but on the whole I may say that the paper has shown sufficiently the marvellous and many-sided activities of this remarkable man in behalf of the Jew and Judaism.

D-1

THE BASIS OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN SY-
AGOGUE.

(A Paper Read Before the Central Conference of American Rabbis,
July 2, 1911, St. Paul, Minn.)

BY RABBI LOUIS WITT, Little Rock, Ark.

A Jew was earning \$12 a week. He was a devout Jew and a man of family. He felt the need of worship and of raising his children in the faith of his fathers. He applied for membership in the Temple. He was told he could not become a member unless he paid at least \$1.50 a month, or bought a pew for \$100. The man could afford only 50 cents a month: even this was a sacrifice, but he was willing to make the sacrifice for the sake of his children, and his higher loyalties. His sacrifice was of no avail. His piety was of no avail. He was barred by the law of the minimum tax.

A Jew was prosperous and pious. He gave liberally of his service and his purse to the Temple. He suffered reverses in business. He was compelled to make a considerable reduction in his dues. He was told that the constitutional provision of the minimum assessment prohibited the acceptance of such low dues, but that he would be welcome in the Temple just the same. He was a proud man. He wanted no dole, no concession. He wanted to pay something—all that he could honestly afford. To be admitted on any other condition had the sting and the stigma of charity. He was barred by the law of the minimum tax.

A Jew joined the Temple. He could afford the minimum tax, but no more. He attended the annual meeting. He was told he had not the right to vote: he was only a contributing member. It is true he was intelligent and devout, and his vote would have furthered the highest interest of the congregation, but to be a

voting member he had to pay a stipulated due. He could not afford to pay it; therefore, he could not vote. It was a national election day. He walked from the house of worship to the polls, and cast his vote for the President of the United States. He was empowered with the right to direct the momentous affairs of the greatest republic of the ages; he was denied the right to direct the small affairs of a local house of worship. Religion was behind politics. The charter of a State conferred upon a common man larger rights and duties than the charter of a house of God. The man pondered on these things, and was put to moral confusion because of them.

A Jew entered a Temple. He was a stranger and took a vacant seat. A lady entered. She looked hard at the stranger. The stranger was embarrassed. The lady informed the stranger he was in her seat. The stranger was still more embarrassed. He hastened to take another seat. The sexton looked hard at him. Again the stranger was embarrassed. The sexton informed the stranger he was in a reserved seat, and showed him to a rear seat. The stranger was astonished. The Temple was three-fourths vacant. Any one could have sat anywhere. He never entered the Temple again.

These facts are typical; they are multiple; they can be counted by the thousands in the Reform Synagogues of our country. What the conditions are in the orthodox synagogues this paper does not attempt to say. It is limited as to time, and is designed for a Conference of Reform Rabbis—therefore, it speaks only of the Reform Synagogue; and the facts indicate that the American Reform Synagogue is, to an excessive degree, a financial and aristocratic institution. It makes money rather than piety the condition of membership. A man may be a saint, but if he be poor he can not become a member. The minimum tax is a perpetual blackball.

These facts indicate that the Temple has not risen to the height of the ideal of the age. Democracy has invaded every avenue of human thought and endeavor. It has invaded religion—and every man is equal in his right to believe. It has invaded jurisprudence—and every man is equal before the law. It has invaded politics.

and every man is equal in his right to the franchise. It has invaded education—and every man is equal in the public school. It has invaded industry—and labor claims an equal right with capital. But it has not yet invaded the synagogue—for there men are still unequal. They are graded and classified according to financial rating. Religion should go before the ages as a pathfinder and guiding star—but the synagogue has not yet caught up with the highest ideal of the modern age. This must not be. The synagogue can not endure in a democratic age on an undemocratic basis. A day of reckoning will come. No thoughtful mind can be satisfied to face the future of Judaism in America with such a barrier of limitation. Reform Judaism in place of being the religion of the progressive Jew, will become in time the religion of the prosperous Jew.

The remedy is simple: First—Abolish the minimum assessment. Retain the assessment system, but let a man pay what he can afford as approved by the Board of Assessors, and let him thereafter be a member with full and equal rights. It would work out in this way: A man applies for membership. He can pay only fifty cents or one dollar a month. The Directory is satisfied he can pay no more. It admits him to full membership. Another man applies and agrees to pay two dollars a month. The Directory is positive he can pay ten dollars. He refuses to pay. The Directory denies him membership until he agrees to pay his assessment, or gives a valid reason for being unable to do so. By this plan parasitism is obviated. The income of the congregation is not lessened, and the door is opened at the lower end to those who, under the present system, can get into the Temple only as visitors and strangers—never as members.

Second. Abolish the assigned pew. Let every member sit where he pleases. Let not the pew be an index of a man's financial standing. Let there be no inequality in the House of God. Is a man nearer God when he sits in a more comfortable pew? The Temple is not a theater. There should be no reserved seats. There are no reserved seats in the fraternal lodges, in the Chambers of Commerce, in the public schools, and even in most of the churches of our country. There should be none in the Temple.

Fellowship, Service, Brotherhood, are the great words in the House of God. All wordly pretentions and distinctions fall from us as we present ourselves before Him who searcheth the heart and holdeth the nations in the hollow of his hands and judgeth the children of men by the invisible yearnings and outreachings of the soul.

Opposed to this change of policy will be, first and foremost, the snob—not the rich man, mind you, for there is many a rich man who is plain and democratic in the highest degree. Reform Judaism would never have had the dignity and authority it enjoys to-day, were it not for those Jews who had the power to achieve success, and who in their success gave liberally and loyally to the faith of their fathers. The snob, however, will tell you that if you open the door to a low rate of assessment, you will make the Temple cheap and common. What a figure in the sight of the Lord the Temple would cut, clad in faded calico and reeking with the sweat of labor! Remember the holy and snobocratic law of שַׁעֲטָנִי thou shalt not mix calico and silk. Those magnificent piles of sculptured stone, towering majestically to the skies, embodying the art of the ages, sanctified by the memorial windows of canonized mercantile prodigies—those monuments of the religious genius of Israel, at the sight of which generations yet unborn will exclaim: כִּי הָיָא חֲכַמְתְּכֶם וּבִינְתְּכֶם לְעֵינֵי הָעַמִּים

Shall these be filled with just plain common people; men who toil in overalls and carry the dinner-pail; women who do their own washing, and nurse their own children? Horrors!! הֲלֵילָהּ לִי It is true a long time ago God said something about being satisfied with מִזְבֵּחַ אֲדָמָה an altar of common earth,—a monition, perhaps, that the yearning for God is as universal as common earth; that the worship of God should be made as accessible as common earth; that the destiny of man is as common as common earth—but that was a long time ago, before the earth was yet blessed with that imperial culmination of cosmical evolution,—the snob! You can not answer the argument of the snob. Where anybody is equal to everybody, why, he can not be “somebody,” and that is all there is to it. It is an argument not of sense but of arrogance, and it towers so big,

with wealth and prestige, that you can not surmount it; you must bore through it.

Again it will be argued that the man who pays more ought to get a better seat than the man who pays less—a most simple and natural standard of measure in this age when even the supernatural is measured according to bulk, digits, and dollars. Is the Temple a theater or stock company; then is it altogether just and necessary that the man who pays the most money or owns the most stock should have the best seat and the biggest say. Is the Temple a House of God? Then should the godliest man—the man who in his heart feels most reverence for God, who in his life makes the biggest sacrifice for God—have, at least, an equal standing with him who, regardless of his godliness, can boast of paying a bigger rate of dues. For it says somewhere in a book that some few people still respect that God judgeth not according to the appearance, but according to the heart; and it would be not altogether unfit for the synagogue which claims that book as its historic justification and the source of its inspiration, to judge men according to such a spiritual judgment. It is indeed a conspicuous fact that the more a man pays in figures the less does he pay in proportion. He who can afford to pay one hundred dollars finds it much easier to pay that much than does he who can pay only one dollar to pay his little. The one-hundred-dollar man will not, because of his magnificent contribution to the Temple, need to deprive himself even of an automobile or a box at the opera, or a trip to Europe, whereas, the one-dollar man needs to toss on sleepless pillow, figuring how to make ends meet, and often must deny himself of the love of little children—the deepest craving of a parent's heart—because he can not afford it. Who, then carries the bigger burden for the Lord, he who pays one hundred dollars, or he who pays one? And if the *מזבח* is, was and ever must be, a place of sacrifice, why should not the poor man be accorded at least equal rights with the rich, inasmuch as his *זבח* is greater? The doctrine, the more money the more rights, is a moral perversity in a House of God. I wonder how the public school, or our own religious school, would affect our children's standard of moral estimates, if the seats were classified according to the tax rate. I wonder how heaven

would look if the Lord patterned it after the Constitution and By-Laws of some of our Temples! It behooves us rabbis to raise our voice in unceasing protest against such a commercialization of the place of our prayers and our ideals. True, we need money to maintain even a House of God, and we must look to those who have been blessed with much to give much, but *איש כמתנת ידו* he who has given much has given in no greater proportion than he who has given little. Each has given what he can afford, with the odds in favor of the cheaper man. The House of God should rest on a basis of service, reverence, and brotherhood, but even on a basis of taxation, we must not forget that proportional taxation is, after all, equal taxation, and should be followed by equal privilege. In other words, and for the last time, the man who pays one hundred dollars is entitled to no more vote and to no better seat than the man who pays one dollar, for each pays what he can afford with only this difference: that it is harder for the latter to pay his one dollar than it is for the former to pay his hundred.

It will no doubt be contended that the proposed reforms will deplete the treasury of the Temple, inasmuch as on the one hand, every pew that is occupied by a poor member is a dispossession or an exclusion of a possible rich member, and, on the other hand, the rich man will not pay as much dues for a pew that belongs promiscuously to every one as he will for a pew that is his exclusive reservation or property. As to the first part of this objection, it may be pointed out that in ninety-five per cent. of the synagogues of the country, the prosperous Jew is already a member, and that, therefore, the reserve space for membership which is to be found in nearly every one of these synagogues, may well be utilized by a less prosperous class, without causing any such dispossession as is feared. Indeed, the income of the congregation would more likely be augmented: For ten one-dollar men equal as much as one ten-dollar man, especially when these ten men fill a space on the membership roster that is otherwise empty, and still more when it is considered that ten souls are being ministered to instead of one. And it is to my mind a slander on the rich Jew to say that he will not pay as much as he does now if he is deprived of the privilege of an assigned pew. He gives liberally to charity, and he expects

no return. Is the House of God so inferior to charity in its appeal to his heart that he will not give to it in the same spirit? We need conjure up no such fear. The assigned pew is, in the main, a custom, a habit. Indeed, the opposition to the abolition thereof springs from a more or less subconscious source, for it rests not so much on reason as on the simple fact that what we have grown used to we are most reluctant to change. Let us change to the open pew, and in a year or two we will be used to it, and all our arguments against it, seemingly supported by reason, will of their own weight, fall to the ground. And in the interval, no Jew, however wealthy he may be, will cut down his dues or resign his membership—that is, if he has any self-respect. Nor need we fear that the parasite will take advantage of the lower rate of admission, for under the new system, the Board of Assessors can exercise control of the same sort and in the same way as it does under the present system. Most of the churches of the country have the open pew, and no doubt there are as many members in the church who pay high dues as there are in the Synagogue. Why, then, should a system which is an established and approved fact in the church, and which is altogether in line with the democratic trend of the age, encounter such vehement opposition and such ominous prediction in the Synagogue? If the income of the American Reform Synagogue is so founded on the assigned pew that it is in danger of collapse on a more democratic basis, then is the Jew's attachment to the Synagogue more of a bargain or trade than a covenant, and he would not be altogether immodest if he ceased to declaim about his "historic sacrifice," and his "divine mission," and his "sublime consecration."

Again, it will be argued that this whole indictment of the American Reform Synagogue is contrary to fact; every one is welcome in the Temple. One does not need to be a member to enjoy the privilege of worship. The right to a pew and to the ballot is, after all, only incidental to the right to worship. No one is turned away from the House of God because he does not or can not pay his dues. The poor man and the stranger are, indeed, invited cordially to join the congregation in divine service, by conspicuous notice in the daily papers. An open Temple is one which, restricted though it may

be in matters of administration, is, in matters of worship, open and free to all. As thus defined the Reform Temple is an open Temple, and any proposition to make it still wider open is futile and impracticable.

A mere quotation, one out of many, that might be given, will show how sophistical this argument is. It is from Wykoff's book "The Workers." Wykoff, a professor of economics in one of the big universities, disguised himself as a laborer, and tramped across the country in order to learn the laborer's life and point of view at first hand. While working in a factory in Chicago he asked a fellow-workman to go to church with him on Sunday, and here is the reply, he received: "Look here, John, it's all right you asking me to go to church, but I ain't going; I used to go regular when I lived to home, altho' I ain't no church member. It was different out there, for most everybody went and chipped in what they could, and everybody sat where they liked, and it wasn't one man's more than another's. You go to church if you like. That's your own business, but I ain't going to no one-horse mission chapel that the rich has put so they won't be bothered with the poor in their own churches. You say they treat you well when you go to church on Michigan Avenue. I don't doubt it. What reason would they have for not treating you well? But, all the same, they take you in for charity, for, you couldn't pay for a seat in one of them churches. The rich folks build their churches for themselves, and they keep them up for themselves, and I ain't never going to interfere with that arrangement."

The professor, in his guise as a laborer, visited one of these fashionable churches. As he came in he heard two ladies in black bartering with a gentleman as to the price of certain sittings which, he overheard, were \$200 a year. He thought of his nine dollars a week, and of the meagre pittance which resulted from utmost care in saving even though he had only himself to support. He thought of his landlady "worn and wan and almost ill," and he remembered the "patient, unflinching courage with which she faced the obligations of her life, and the heart-breaking economies by which she must meet many of its duties. "I was not present," the professor-laborer says, "merely as a worshipper, but also as a

member of my chosen order. I tried to see with their eyes, and then to think their thoughts, and feel their emotions. When I held myself honestly to this task, with the aid of what I had learned directly from the men and caught of their ways of thinking, it was another revulsion of feeling which set in."

Furthermore, the door of the Temple is not where the threshold and the hinges are. The door of the Temple is its constitution. To say to a man on the outside: "Welcome, come in," and on the inside to show him an organic law which says to him, "You can not become one of us", is to make that man feel that the whole business is a sham. Membership is by no means incidental. On the contrary, it should be made to the utmost degree accessible. Membership makes *a* Temple *my* Temple. It gives me a proprietary sense in the Temple, and a student of human nature must know how much the proprietary sense is at the basis of our interests and even of our morals. If a thing—be it a business, a kingdom, or a soul—belong to some one else, why should I be proud of it or labor for it? Attach it to my personal self, let it belong in part to me, and you make me in part accountable for it, and anything for which I am in part accountable is to that extent moral. That is the psychology of it. It is the highest wisdom and a most imperative duty for the American Reform Temple, to give to every Jew, as far as possible, a sense of ownership in the Temple. And yet how many bars and barriers we have erected around this sacrosanct citadel of our congregational life. A man must pay so much, and he merely gets in; then he must pay some more, and he gets a vote; then he must pay some more, and he gets a seat away from the door; so that by the time he gets to be a full member in a comfortable pew, he is likely to be thinking more of his purse than his God! The average salesman or clerk earns less than \$100 a month; the average laborer less than \$75. A very great, if not the major, part of American Jewry is in the class of those who earn \$100 or less. The average minimum cost of membership for a man with a family in the American Reform Temple, is, on a rough estimate, at least \$3 a month, including the annual rental of pews in the smaller congregations, but not including the purchase of pews in the larger congregations. For a man with a family earning

less than \$15 or even \$100 a month, \$3 a month for dues is a considerable tax which he can not pay, or which he finds it so hard to pay that he should not be asked to pay it. Add to this the purchase price of a pew which ranges from \$100 to \$1,100, and which is a condition of voting membership in nearly all of the larger congregations of the country, and you will realize why so many Jews, in numbers ever growing as our immigrant population turns more and more from mercantile to industrial pursuits, must be forever barred from membership in the Temple, unless there is a change in the constitution of the Temple. What if the American Republic said to a man: You may enter at the port and make a living anywhere and at anything you please, but you can not become a citizen until you can pay, at least, so much, and then you can vote only for municipal offices until you can pay so much more. It would be a backward step in political evolution of about five hundred years. It would be a policy as futile as was the effort of the old woman in the fable to sweep back the waves of the ocean with a broom. You can not keep a man, an immigrant and an alien on financial grounds. In time he will claim citizenship—he will fight for it—and in the end he will win it. That is the signification and the justification of the American Republic. Our country is great and unique because it asks of an alien, in order to make of him a citizen, only a few years of residence for naturalization and an oath of allegiance, but as soon as he becomes a citizen, he becomes by law the equal of any other citizen, and when he casts his vote, he is entitled to his place in the line, even though he is a hod-carrier, and the Chief Executive of the nation is behind him. So, in the Temple you can not keep a regular worshipper in the status of mere worshipper, because of some financial by-law. If he has been naturalized by years of residence; if he is ready to take an oath of allegiance; if he is willing to pay the tax he can afford, little though it may be, then he will feel that he has a legitimate right to membership and the Temple must concede that right or it will belie its own ideal, provoke mistrust and reproach on the part of the common people in an age of the common people, and lose its moral leadership in the world.

And now just a concrete example of the effort made just two months ago in Temple Bnai Israel, Little Rock, to introduce the unrestricted minimum, the unassigned pew, and the universal ballot. I trust I will be pardoned the unavoidable personal reference. I shall not dwell on the universal accompaniments of every assertion of leadership—predictions by opponents of dire failure, personal damage, congregational upheaval; pleadings by friends to let well enough alone, not to make oneself the scapegoat in a noble but futile undertaking. Neither shall I dwell on the tactical and diplomatic phase of an undertaking that involved a change of habit and constitution by which a community had lived for half a century, and that even at best was bound to beget ominous rumblings and inflammatory eruptions. I will simply say that I made a presentation of my case before my Board of Trustees. At that meeting a majority of the Board was opposed to the change, but further consideration thereof was deferred to the next monthly meeting. At that second meeting a majority of the Board would have voted favorably, I am very sure, but the matter was one which really should have been decided by a congregational meeting, to which it was referred. Three things are here to be noted: Of those members of the Board who were opposed, five are among the oldest and most respected members of the congregation, and might easily be said to be its preponderant and dominant element. Secondly: Our Temple is rather small for our membership, there being about 240 members with a capacity of 450 seats on the main floor—less than two seats to a member. Thirdly: There are only four or five Jewish congregations in the country which have adopted the proposed reform, and this put me in the position of an innovator. Well, a congregational meeting was called. I made a personal canvass of especially those members of the congregation who paid the most money and owned the best pews and had the most to lose by the change. I went to them not to persuade or to argue but to secure a promise to be present at the meeting. I wanted a big meeting, and I did not want it said after the meeting that I had “packed” it with the cheaper class who had most to gain by the change. I did not want victory at the price of discord and rupture in the congregation. I had faith in my cause. I felt that

it was bound to triumph some day. I was willing merely to plant the seed, leaving it to a future year to gather the harvest. The meeting was a big one—the biggest in years. The majority was composed of the wealthier class. The arguments advanced, pro and con, were such as have been already advanced in this paper. At the end of the meeting within a few minutes of midnight a resolution was passed reducing the minimum rate for membership for a married or a single man to one dollar a month, with full right to the ballot. This was a practical, though not a total abolition of the minimum assessment. As to the unassigned pews—a resolution was adopted that no action be taken thereon at that time. The victory was a qualified one, as is usually the case with all first attempts at reform, but as a moral victory it was unqualified. I was myself surprised at the amount of favorable moral sentiment that was stirred up. I was told the next day by some of the most prominent and wealthy members of the congregation that they were in favor of the proposed reforms, and that had I been more persistent at the congregational meeting I would have prevailed, but that they were glad I was not, as they did not want to force such issues over the determined opposition of the oldest and most faithful servants of the congregation. I was glad for the same reason, and for that very reason I was not more persistent. Rome was not built in a day. A fifty-year habit can not be changed over night. The very members of the Board who opposed the reform—and there are no finer men in any congregation—said in open meeting that in principle the reform was just and good, and in time would prevail, but that their Temple was too small, and they were not yet ready for it. In a larger Temple they would be disposed to favor it. As a matter of fact, our Temple is quite small for the membership. It is for sale now, and a new Temple in Little Rock even next year would, I am sure, be an open Temple. It was most suggestive to me that the very sons of the old and faithful members opposed their own fathers even in open meeting. It is not to be expected that an older mind, habituated to one way for half a century, would yield to a change, no matter how noble, as quickly as would a young mind. It would have been much easier to carry the reform with a Board composed not so dominantly of older

men as is the case with so many congregations of the country. Then, too, our Temple is quite small on the big holy days with an average of less than two seats to a member. Again, this is not the case with many of the congregations of the country. I submitted the following question to rabbis in cities of less than one hundred thousand population: In case your Temple was made altogether open and free, for member and stranger, on the great holy days, would you be obliged to turn any one away for lack of room or sitting?—and out of 41 returns, 34 were of the opinion that no one would have to be turned away. And by the adoption of the card system in use in Detroit and New York, even the Temples in the biggest cities, if they reduced their dues and democratized their pews, would not be too small, at least for the membership on the great holy days. True, some strangers might have to be excluded, but in this world we must be satisfied with only partial realizations of our ideals—which, however, does not excuse us from raising those partial realizations to a maximum. Then, too, I was fighting the battle practically alone. Again and again the question was thrown at me: “How many Synagogues in the country have adopted such a reform?” And I could only answer “Most of the churches in the country; all of the churches, with perhaps a single exception, in Little Rock—but only three or four synagogues.” With most people precedent is irrefutable argument, and I did not have enough precedent.

If this Conference would endorse the proposed reforms, if it would set aside one day for preaching in their behalf, it would thus make the agitation nation-wide, and give to it adequate educational publicity in the Jewish press; then would one rabbi feel the backing of the other rabbis; one congregation feel the pressure of other congregations—and in five years, fifty per cent. of the American synagogues would be open, democratic and free. It would be the beginning of the end; it would be the case of the *vis inertiae*—a thing is hard to start, but once started, it is hard to stop. It is to my mind altogether a question of leadership on the part of the rabbis. If the rabbis themselves have faith in a more popular and spiritual house of worship, if they will stand courageously and collectively by that faith, then is that faith bound to prevail.

In the light of the foregoing I beg, therefore, to submit the following recommendations for the endorsement of this Conference:

1. The abolition of the minimum assessment.
2. The extension of the ballot to each assessment, no matter how small.
3. The installation of the unassigned pew.
4. The dedication of the Sabbath to preaching on these reforms.
5. The appointment of a special committee on the Open Temple.

(This committee should keep in correspondence with the rabbis of the country as to what they are doing with regard to the proposed reforms; should furnish them information and helpful material; should educate the Jewish public by frequent items in the Jewish press; should tabulate results, and report back to the next Conference.)

To my mind this movement presents itself as a moral crusade. It is a movement to make, not dues, but sacrifice and reverence, the supreme standard of value in the synagogue; to put the synagogue to the test of squaring its practice with its ideals; to place the synagogue as the custodian of the divine revelation in the forefront of moral leadership. The open Temple is bound to come. We have passed through the Dark Age—we will pass through the ages of commercialism. Already is ours an age of the common people. As never before in the history of the world is the common man asserting power and appropriating privilege. To-day the Temple says to the common man: You may enter on sufferance. To-morrow the common man will repudiate the Temple as an anachronism. Already the signs are ominous. There is a handwriting on the wall. Social settlements, civic forums, articles of protest on the spiritual unrest, books on the modern religion and the social crisis, indictments by labor and socialism, the evacuation of the houses of worship by the working classes—are these mere ephemeralities, or are they portentous prophecies? And what would be our defense, indeed, if to-morrow some popular newspaper or magazine should make and publish an investigation of the basis of membership in the Amer-

ican Synagogue in the light of the high prerogatives of Israel and the advanced social standards of the modern age! My conviction, as positive as any I have ever had in my life, is that the American Reform Synagogue is, to-day, exclusive, fashionable and undemocratic, to a degree that is altogether out of proportion with the ideals which it professes: My vision, as clear as any I have ever had in my life, is that the American Reform Synagogue must either advance to a more popular and spiritual constitution, or it will be shoved into the rear as an outworn institution: My experience, as recent as sixty days ago, teaches me that we, the rabbis of the American Reform Synagogue, need only live up to our preaching; need only assert our leadership; need only say and say over again, that it is wrong for a godly man to be barred from membership in a House of God, for no other reason than that he can pay only a one dollar rather than a two or a five dollar tax, that it is wrong for a man who pays only one dollar—the maximum he can afford, to be forced into a disenfranchised and poverty labelled pew, as compared with a man who pays one hundred dollars which, nevertheless, he can easily afford; that it is wrong thus to exclude, segregate, and humiliate the common man in an age of the common people—we, the rabbis, need only do this, and we may be sure that we will be doing the work of the Lord, and that in a few years the Lord will crown our work with blessing.

In fancy I saw the Lord enter the Temple. He saw that men were graded not according to their godliness, but according to the outward appearance. The rich were in the best pews; the poor were in the worst. Some of the poor had loving and saintly hearts—so also had some of the rich. Some of the rich had selfish and vicious hearts—so also had some of the poor. The rich laughed and loved and prayed, and fulfilled a destiny—so, too, did the poor. The poor toiled and suffered and rendered service in faithfulness—so, too, did the rich. Each needed the other; each could rise to heaven only by helping the other. The Lord put them one at the side of the other—and the Lord saw that it was good.

D-2

A DISCUSSION OF RABBI WITT'S PAPER.

BY RABBI LEO M. FRANKLIN, Detroit, Mich.

There is perhaps no man in this Conference who is more deeply interested in the subject of Rabbi Witt's paper, nor more highly gratified that it should have been presented to this body than am I. Perhaps it is a phase of our native conceit that we are always more or less pleased to have others express the convictions of our own hearts, and to be able to say that at last the prediction made by ourselves has come to fulfillment. The fact is that for at least the last eight years I have been putting to practical test some of the very theories set forth by Rabbi Witt in his paper, and with results not at all less gratifying than in his optimism he suggests are likely to be brought about by a change in our congregational system such as he believes ought to be introduced. There can be no doubt that in many of our congregations, men have been chosen for positions of leadership, not because of their ability and their character, but very largely because they have been large contributors to the congregational exchequer, and correspondingly the poor man in the congregation has been neglected and pushed aside. Now, I am not so impractical nor so foolish as to undervalue the contribution in money which the rich man makes to the cause of the congregation, but neither am I so blind as to fool myself believing that his money contribution is worth as much to the upbuilding of our institutions as is the moral support which is given by the man who sometimes has little or nothing of material character to contribute. Fortunate that congregation whose leaders are men of material means as well as of generous spirit. Sometimes one finds a man at the head of a congregational organization whose Jewishness is so intense and whose spirit is so fine that from the very nature of things he surrounds himself with the very best men in his com-

munity to carry on the affairs of the congregation. And under such leadership the spirit can not be otherwise than fine and generous. But, after all, such instances are comparatively few, and it is a cause of frequent humiliation to the Jew of finer sensibilities that mere poverty is a barrier not only to a man's official recognition in the congregation, but even to his comfort as a guest of the congregation, much less to his rights as a member during times of worship. Now it is my contention, and I am sure that Rabbi Witt fully agrees with me in this, that if there should be inequalities of any kind in the house of God, they should be based not upon what a man pays in dollars and cents to the support of the congregational organization, but rather they should be proportioned to the sacrifice that he makes in paying anything. Now, the fact is so obvious that it requires no argument, that the average man who pays from twenty to thirty dollars a year for the support of his congregation, makes a tremendously greater sacrifice than does he who contributes three or four hundred dollars per annum to the same institution. In the latter case, it means that the man will have a few hundred dollars less in his bank account at the end of the year, the exact amount of which he never knows, but in the former instance it means that the man in order to affiliate himself with a congregational organization, has sacrificed pleasures and comforts and even necessities in order to pay even a comparatively paltry sum to the support of the congregation. Now there can be no question about it that the ideal toward which we ought to strive in our congregational organizations is that each man should give that which his heart prompteth him to give, and in accordance with his means, "Isch K'matnath Yodo." Of course, I know that some men under such a scheme, would give not in accordance with their means, but as one of my friends has expressed it, "in accordance with their meanness." My experience goes to prove that by far the great majority of men are somewhat more high minded in these matters than many of us are willing to credit them with being, and that instead of giving less than they do under a coercive plan, they would stretch a point and give a little more than they conveniently can, under a plan of voluntary gifts. Indeed; I may cite as the experience of my own congregation wherein the annual

dues, while subject to the approval of the Board of Directors, are yet voluntary, that in the past eight years we have not had half a dozen cases where the Board of Directors were called upon to urge a member to give more than he himself had voluntarily offered, and twice within the last five years when it seemed necessary to increase our budget to a very material extent, we found that when voluntary increases in the dues were called for, that in both instances the amount thus voluntarily offered far exceeded the sum which would have been levied under an enforced assessment. But granting the impracticability in some instances of carrying out the voluntary assessment plan, due to considerations of property rights, I do hold that there are few congregations wherein at least the unassigned pew might not be introduced so that whatever inequalities there may be so far as the taxing arrangement of the congregation is concerned, at least within the House of God and in the rights of worship all men should be equal and the rich man's corner and the poor man's corner should be forever done away with.

When eight years ago, as the absolute pioneer in the movement, Temple Beth El of Detroit introduced the unassigned pew, many were the critics and the scoffers and the prophets of evil. A few within our own ranks looked askance upon the innovation and some seven or eight men fought it with all their might during a period of three years. To-day it is with gratitude I say it that there is not a member of our entire congregation who under any circumstances would go back to the old plan. Aside from everything else, the plan makes for order and decorum in the worship; it brings the congregation to the Temple early on occasions when the Temple is likely to be crowded, it influences families to come to the house of worship together in order that they may be seated together. It makes it possible that not the poor man shall always sit in the balcony but that sometimes the wealthiest and the most influential members of the congregation shall sit there. And it is a fact that we have never had a complaint from those who coming late, have found the lower auditorium occupied, but naturally they have gone up-stairs and been contented there. It is true the plan requires tact and judgment on the part of competent ushers, but so does

any other plan. It makes for democratization of the synagogue and for a feeling of fellowship among the members. It is the one practical plan according to which the poor man shall not be humiliated because of his poverty, and by which the wealth of the rich man shall not be his strong tower of defense in the congregational organization.

I wish that Rabbi Witt had gone just a step farther in his argument and offered a plea for some uniformity in the fiscal regulations of congregations to the end that there might be a closer cooperation among sister congregations and less of the spirit of competition. How baneful is the influence of the competitive spirit upon the spiritual life of the congregations, I am sure almost any man upon the floor of this convention could testify, but there are some instances that might be cited, one within my own recent experience, which go to prove that the present fiscal systems in vogue in our congregations are not only inadequate to meet the present situation, but that they tend to foster a spirit of rivalry and hostility and unworthy competition between congregations that would be a discredit to business men of the lowest type. In the instance referred to, the competitive spirit did not even concern congregations in the same city, but it concerned congregations separated one from the other by a distance of not less than three hundred miles, the facts in the case being that a family of very large means disgruntled at the congregation in the city in which they lived, because it asked a reasonable contribution from them, made application and were accepted by a second congregation in a city in which they had no interests whatsoever, at an absolutely nominal rate. What can we expect of the individual Jews if our organizations are willing to stoop to such a level? The whole problem before us is, not, it seems to me, as Rabbi Witt holds, the problem of the poor man and the synagogue; more particularly, it is the problem of the rich man and the synagogue. The poor man, as a rule, does his duty. It is the rich man who is frequently at fault, and it is incumbent upon us, it seems to me, as leaders and teachers of our people, so to influence public opinion in our various communi-

ties as to make possible such change in the internal policies of our various congregations as to give to every man who wants to be of us and with us, the right to worship God untrammelled because of his poevrty.

Rabbi Witt has done a great service in presenting this paper to the Conference, and I hope that it may be fruitful of those results for which he and I and many others among us have so long been hoping and working.

E

LEOPOLD LOEW.

(1811-1875.)

(A Paper Read Before the Central Conference of American Rabbis
July 3, 1911, at St. Paul, Minn.)

BY RABBI JULIUS RAPPAPORT, Chicago, Ill.

Among the illustrious men, whose fame illumines the sky of nineteenth century Judaism, there is none that surpasses in splendor and brilliancy that of Leopold Loew. In attempting to describe the work and influence of men like Loew, one feels one's own conceit perceptibly lowered and humbled. In comparing the men that laid the foundation to Jewish science—Zunz and Geiger, Luzzatto and Rapoport—with the generations following them, one can not help admitting that “the intelligence of the forebears was as wide as the gates of the temple, while ours is but like the eye of the needle.” (T. B. Erub.—53.) One is forcibly reminded of the telling allegory of the teacher depicting the ever diminishing size of the succeeding generations: “Abba Saul was so tall that his successor Tryphon reached only to his shoulders, yet Tryphon was not small, as he was towering head and shoulder above his successor, Akiba B. Joseph. Still Akiba, in his turn, was taller than Rabbi Juda who followed him, while ‘Hijja’ the successor to Juda came only up to the shoulders of the Prince.” (Nid.—24.) However, having been asked to assume the task, I have the excuse of Rabbi Josse B. Halaftha who, “Though knowing that he was not a Kohen, yet in deference to the wish of his colleagues he would even mount the ‘duchan.’” (Sabb.—118).

Leopold Loew was born May 22nd, 1811, at Czernahora, Moravia, the country that gave Judaism, Adolph Jellinek, Moritz

Steinschneider, Isaac Hirsch Weiss, David Kaufman and other scholars of fame. A descendant of a rabbinical family, he traces his ancestry through many a Landesrabbiner, of Boskowitz and Nikolsburg, up to the celebrated Liwa B. Bezalel Landesrabbiner of Prague. His parents, being the only Jewish family in the village, maintained for him a private tutor, to teach him the Bible and the Talmud, while to read and to write he learned from the village schoolmaster. At the age of thirteen he entered the Jeshiba of Joachim Duetschman, of Trebitsch, where he remained for two years. Believing with R. Hasda that "it is not profitable to learn from one teacher alone," (Abo. Zar.—19), young Loew went to Leipzig, entering at the Jeshiba of R. Baruch Frankel and from there to Eisenstadt, Hungary, to study under R. Moses Perla. At the age of nineteen he was known as a keen "pilpulist," and having now laid the foundation to that marvelous Talmudical learning, which is the distinguishing feature of all his works, he now devoted more time to the study of the Hebrew language. His Hebrew style, examples of which may be found in *he-Haluz*, *ha Shackar*, *Kerem—Hemed* and *Ben Chananjah*, is characteristic for its lucidity and beauty of diction.

PREPARING FOR THE MINISTRY.

To prepare himself fittingly for the Rabbinical office, however, Loew now bent all his efforts upon the study of the Codes and Casuists under the guidance of Loew Schwab, Rabbi of Prossnitz, supporting himself by teaching in the Talmud Torah there. Influenced no doubt by Schwab, Loew in connection with his rabbinical studies, devoted a good deal of time to the study of secular languages; German, French and Italian. Although he now had the "*Hattarath-Horaah*," he gave up hope of ever receiving the "*Semicha*" from Nehemieas Trebitsch, Landes-Rabbiner at the time, who ordained such only that could neither read nor write. (*Gesammelte Schriften* 2-203). Prossnitz, once the home of Loebele Prossnitz, the pseudo-Messiah, was still reputed to be the headquarters of the Sabbathaiaans. To be familiar with German books was enough to suspect one of Sabbathaian inclinations. As late as 1863, Adolph Jellinek, the famous preacher of Vienna, ex-

plains the leanings of Aaron Chorin, rabbi in Arad, Hungary, towards Reform, on the grounds of "His possible sympathies with the Sabbathaian heresy." (Ges. Schr. 5-192). Now, the fact that it was known that Loew kept up a correspondence with Chorin, was enough to condemn him without a hearing, being that Chorin was the only rabbi, excepting Moses Kunitz, another Hungarian rabbi, who dared to approve the reforms introduced by the leaders of the Hamburg Reform Temple, which were severely condemned by all the rabbis of Germany. Thoroughly disgusted, Loew now intended choosing another career. But induced, in all likelihood by Chorin, he left his birthplace and fatherland and went to Hungary, studying at Ofen and Pest, physics, mathematics, Latin, Greek and Magyar language and history. Two years later we find him in the Lyceum at Pressburg and under the very eyes of Moses Sofer, the arch-enemy of all non-talmudical learning. He qualified here after three years of diligent study in philosophy, logic, metaphysics, Biblical-Exegesis, Christian Theology, dogmatics, hermeneutics, ethics and pedagogy. Thus equipped for the ministry in a manner very rare Loew, more fortunate than Geiger and Einhorn soon received a call from Nagy Kanizsa, having been recommended for the place by I. Noah Mannheimer, in whose home he was a tutor to the sons of the famous preacher of Vienna.

PERSECUTIONS.

As soon, however, as his election became known in Pressburg, his enemies there, who could not forgive him for entering the Lyceum instead of the Jeshiba, spread forthwith the most abominable falsehoods regarding his character and his "Goyish mode of living." (Orient 1841, No. 22). He declined, therefore, the call unless it was made unanimous. Having been reassured, however, by the congregation, he entered upon the duties of his office with zeal and ardor and some time later he married the daughter of Loew Schwab, who meantime was elected to the rabbinate of Pest.

FANATICAL PERSECUTIONS AT PAPA.

Although his work at N Kanizsa was entirely successful, nevertheless, importuned by friends from Papa, he accepted, in 1845, a call to the rabbinate there which promised larger opportunities

and a broader field of activities. No sooner, however, did it transpire that he was to go to a place of greater influence, than his enemies at Pressburg set all the nefarious machinery of infamy and slander to work to prevent his coming there. The opposition against Einhorn and Geiger was child's-play when compared with the vehement storm that was aroused against Loew. Letters, threatening his very life, if he dared to go to a new place, were written to Loew himself, and other missives were dispatched to the Orthodox element at Papa and the surrounding communities, urging them to rise in protest against Loew. The blind bigots, moreover, spread the most abominable slanders, vilifying his character, and above all took out an injunction from the court charging fraud in his election. This naturally delayed his coming there; prevent it, however, it could not. The zealots were defeated at every point, and Dr. Loew held his triumphal entry into Papa, welcomed by the dignitaries and the better element of the people. Still the fanatics did not desist. If anything their vehemence was more furious. The holy men from Pressburg sent circular letters to the members of the congregation at Papa, in which they are emphatically warned that: "It is a deadly sin to have any dealings with your rabbi, either while he is alive or dead." Keneseth Israel, 218-1886).

They moreover, sent a delegation of nine prominent rabbis to Baron Rothschild at Vienna urging him to use his influence with the government to unseat Loew. Failing in this, they hired false witnesses to testify that Loew was seen eating trepha food. But the witness confessed he was bribed by Rudolph Toch, and the latter was actually imprisoned for his nefarious act. (Allg. Ztng. d. Jud. 106; 480-1847). Thus justice prevailed, for the time. But for the time only. Indeed the fanatic's further denunciations of Loew as being a "liberal," far from hurting him in the eyes of the patriotic Magyars, was rather injurious to the denunciators themselves, being branded in their turn as traitors. But no sooner did the revolution fail (in 1849) than his enemies denounced him now to the reactionary government as a "dangerous rebel," and Loew was, indeed, arrested and tried for high treason. That he was not hanged on the gallows with the rest of the rebels, was not due to lack of zeal on the part of his enemies, but rather to the

influence of powerful friends. But his trials in prison were enough to disgust him with Papa and he gladly accepted a call (1850) to Szegedin, where he worked in undisturbed peace to the end of his useful life. (Oct. 13, 1875). To describe the influence of a life so richly blessed as that of Loew, is impossible within the frame of the few minutes allotted to me. I shall therefore give you just a mere outline of his achievements.

HIS ELOQUENCE.

Already at Nagy-Kanizsa he had established for himself a reputation as a fiery speaker and a silver-tongued orator, whose sermons and speeches were heard and read with eagerness and avidity. There was scarcely any public celebration, throughout the land, civic, social or religious, in which Leopold Loew did not participate; and usually as many Christians heard his sermons as Jews. His fame as preacher may be judged by the fact that one of his sermons was printed by the government in the public school reader, and during the revolution many of his patriotic speeches were ordered printed and distributed among the soldiers. Count Carl Eotvos, speaking reminiscently of Loew says: "When a young student I went to Papa, it seemed as if the Patriarch of the Old Testament had been resurrected before us, when we beheld his reverend, solemn and dignified figure. His speech to the national guards we read over and over again, hiding the manuscript secretly during the days of national mourning. What a great speech that was." (Egyetertes, June 8, 1880). In a characterization of the members attending the Leipsic Synod, we read about Loew: "As soon as he raises his voice, he dominates his audience immediately. Each of his words is deliberate and reflected. The fulness of his Talmudical knowledge, the natural logic of his conclusions, his thoughtful exposition of the scriptural text, indicate the acute thinker. His words expressed in a lovely, gentle manner, are gladly complied with. How profitable it is to be in his company."

PATRIOTISM.

Though not a native Hungarian, he was an ardent patriot and espoused the cause of Magyardom, to which he devoted his facile

pen and fervent eloquence. To Magyarize the Jews, he began preaching in that language, soon after he entered the ministry at N. Kanizsa (1844), being one of the first to preach in Magyar. He organized schools for the young and old, to teach the accents in which the Magyar gives expression to his intellectual and cultural life. His efforts in this direction were universally acknowledged and favorably commented upon by the leading newspapers of the country. (The Pesti Hirlap, 1845, No. 19, Egyetertes, June 8, 1880; Pesti Divatlap, 1845, No. 19). It was no doubt owing to his influence that the patriotism of the Hungarian Jew expressed itself by the forming of entire regiments of Jewish soldiers to aid the cause of independence, and the congregation at Pest sold the silver paraphernalia from the sacred scrolls and equipped the soldiers from the proceeds thereof. While he was not the only rabbi in Hungary to exchange the Bible for the sword during the revolutionary period—among others there were Ignatz Einhorn, rabbi of Pest Reform congregation, Loepold Rockonstein, rabbi of Nagy Varad; Moses Bruck, rabbi of Nagy Becskerek and Adolph Huebsch, late rabbi of New York, yet Leopold Loew, who left his peaceful study and joined the national guards at Papa, going with them to the encampment, inspired the recruits by his fiery eloquence to deeds of courage and bravery. His famous "Tabori Beszed" (Camp Speech) a gem of eloquence, was printed and distributed to the recruits, the contents of which inspired them with the spirit of patriotism.

EMANCIPATION.

From the day he assumed his charge at N. Kanizsa, in 1841, he passionately espoused the cause of Magyarization, realizing that emancipation could be acquired through it alone. Yet behind his efforts at Magyarization, there was one supreme purpose evident: that of attaining through it the coveted goal: emancipation of the Jews. For this sacred cause he employed his best efforts and energies. He wrote, he spoke and worked for that cause incessantly and indefatigably, till, in 1867, when his life's work in that regard was finally crowned with success. Every movement on the part of individuals and the government, unpropitious and

antagonistic to the cause of emancipation, he watched zealously and eagerly, protesting against and denouncing their evil designs.

When in 1844 Moritz Ballagi, the apostate Jew, was denounced by the Jews for his contemptible attack upon them, and for calling upon them to renounce their Judaism and embrace Christianity in a body, and Dr. Szeikaep, the pastor of the Metropolitan church, sought to make of it a political issue, trying to show that "Jews will never become Magyars, being that they look upon converts from their ranks to that of the Magyar church as a desertion, and therefore they do not deserve to and should not be emancipated," Leopold Loew, pointing out the insulting attitude of Christianity, in an open letter told the pastor of the Lutheran church such naked truths, as no one else would have dared to utter, and which created quite a sensation. (Allg. Ztng. d. Jud. 1844-48; 681, Ges. Sch. 331-IV).

In 1848 he addressed an open declaration to the government demanding the acknowledgement of the Jewish religion on the same footing as that of other religions, and a year later he protested against Kossuth, the president of the new republic, who intended to make political emancipation of the Jews dependent upon their own religious emancipation and reformation of the synagogue, for which Kossuth intended to convene a Jewish Hungarian Synhedrin a la Napoleon. His open letter to Aug. V. Trefort, a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, who, as Minister of Education would not appoint a Jew as a professor, created quite a stir throughout the land. (Ges. Sch. IV.-481). But his protest against the government, for intending to appoint separate school inspectors for Jewish schools, was nothing short of a sensation. In bold, courageous words he declared: "The Jews of Hungary do not request, do not beg; they demand full and unrestricted enjoyment of civil and religious rights, because they bear the burdens of citizenship." (Ben. Chan. 1863-VI.-474). He successfully protested against the government when it intended to put a stamp tax upon every Kethuba and Shtar-Chalitz. But his criticism of the government in reference to the new marriage laws brought him from the military courts a fine of two weeks' imprisonment in jail, which was suspended, however, on his Majesty's birthday.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS NATIONALISM.

In these days of Zionism and nationalism it will be interesting to learn Loew's opinion in reference to Jewish nationalism. In the argument against emancipation the Jews were charged with being a nation within a nation. Leopold Loew protested against such charges and declared that: "Jews are only a religious community and are members of the countries in which they live." (G. S. IV.-385). "The French Jews are as much strangers to the German Jews, and these in turn to the Italian Jews, these again to the English Jews, as are the Christian inhabitants of these countries to the Christians of other countries." (Ibid. 360). "The laws of the countries in which they happen to live are their (the Jews') laws; the interests of the country, their interests; the national hopes, their own hopes. No, the Jews have no distinct nationality. They are only a religious community. Much as we are inclined to believe in the Old Testament prophecy, the restoration of the Jewish state to-day is altogether an Utopia. (Ibid. 361-62). In the same spirit he replies to the author of "Rom and Jerusalem." (M. Hess. Leipsic 1862). "We hold the author's program of a Jewish nation for an empty phantom. From the mixture of Germanic and Gallic ingredients you cannot form a Jewish nation. (G. S. 1-355).

AS A THEOLOGICAL AUTHORITY.

When we read in *Augsburger Allg. Zeitung* (Oct. 23, 1875-296) that Leopold Loew was "Like one of the Geonim of old to whom the governments, societies and individuals turn for multitudinous casuistic questions, it is certainly no exaggeration, for he was, indeed, the foremost authority on Jewish theology. It would be difficult to pick out one question in preference to the other as each in itself is highly interesting. As an illustration, however, of the difference fifty years will make in the history of religious development, we will give one question as an example: "Has the congregation a right to exclude single or unmarried men from its membership? Are there religious functions which unmarried men may not perform?" (Ges. Schr. IV 146). To-day we are at a loss to find means how to bring the young man to the syn-

agogue. Fifty years ago they were fighting to get in, but were not wanted. Geiger in appreciation of this part of Loew's work says: During the ten years of the existence of the Ben Chananjah there appeared in this magazine, besides studies of great merit, contributing to the history of religion, the caustic "Opinions" of the editor concerning the most diversified questions touching daily life as well as to find the origin, nature and development of customs, rites and ceremonies, evidencing a clear insight, which by his solid scholarship he knows how to employ with great skill. (*Zeitschrift W. U. L.* 4.267.) Being the foremost authority, it is but natural that the government turned to him for expert opinion on all matters pertaining to communal and ritual controversies which the different factions in Judaism took to the courts for adjustment. The oath *More-Judaico*, a form for which the government asked him to submit, was abolished entirely through his efforts.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL WORKS.

Interesting as it would be, time will not permit me to enter upon an analysis of his contributions towards the history of Jews and Judaism in general such as "*Gesch. d. Maehrischem Landesrabbinate*," "*Das Vereeiswesen in Israel*," "*Die Grosse Synode*," *Gesch. d. Kabbala*, and those of Hungary in special, many articles and brochures upon which he has issued *e. g.* "*Ungar, Municipalein u. Juden*," "*Gesch. d. Ung. Sabbathæer*," "*Vergang. u. Gegenw. d. Hassidier*" and above all a greater volume "*Der Juedische Congress*." (Pest 1871) pertaining to the political, religious and cultural history of the Jews of Hungary. Nor can we enter upon his contributions towards Biblical Exegesis, a greater work upon which he published, in 1855, entitled "*Hamafteah*," *Einleitung in die heil. Schrift und Geschichte d. Schrift Auslegung*, which to this day is still considered a standard work; but we cannot refrain from devoting a few paragraphs to his greater works on Talmudical Archæology, two complete volumes of which appeared under the name of "*Graphische Requisiten*." (Leipsic 1870), and "*Die Lebensalter*." (Szegedin 1875). (An other volume was to be devoted to the history of the modern synagogue with reference to the emancipations of

the Jews; Reform and its history; still another volume to the history, form, plan, place of the synagogue and its requisites, furniture, architecture, and all references made thereto in the voluminous theological literature. This, however, is extant in fragmentary form only, as he was unable to finish it when death snatched his busy pen from his hand). The volumes are veritable mines of the richest ore of gold of learning. While he modestly calls them "Beitraege zur jued. Alterthumsunde," they are infinitely more than mere dry Talmudical Archæology. "Jewish Archæology is not confined to matters and institutions of the church—like the Christian one—it is rather a history of civilization, and in a larger sense a history of religion," to supply which was the object of Loew's works. His was not the creative mind of Geiger; he was not a keen critic like Rappoport, nor yet an original thinker like Zunz. But in his wonderful mastery of rabbinical lore, and in his uncommonly wide range of erudition in the literature of ancient and modern nations, none was peer to him. Loew's wonderful erudition was duly appreciated by that master of learning, Franz Delitzsch, who in reviewing the "Lebensalter" says: "Leopold Loew manifests anew not only his wonderful mastery of Jewish literature in its totality as well as in its remotest corners, but also a rare historical knowledge and a phenomenal erudition, to whom an expression from Claude Harms is as much at his disposal as one from Heine." (Centralblatt 1875-27).

HIS AIM TO PROVE THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION.

To analyze or even to enumerate all the writings of Loew is impossible in a short sketch. The mere bibliography of his works in the fifth volume of his *Ges. Schriften* comprise 19 closely printed pages, and we simply mention here such as "Die Grundlehre d. Rel. Israels;" "Juedische Dogumen;" "Die Tradition;" "Eherechtl. Studien," and many other studies in Jewish theology and dogmatism. Through all his writings one supreme effort is clearly discernible to prove for Talmud and Halacha what Geiger and others tried to prove for the Bible: a steady growth, a continuous development, in other words the history of religion. Zunz endeavors to write the literary history of the Jews; Rapoport sought to supply

the biographical history and Greatz the political history; Loew's efforts are bent upon providing the religious history of the Jews. While Mises and Gordon were destructive and Krochmal and Schorr polemical in their tendencies, Loew was apologetical. He set out "To illumine the darkness in which former generations walked till they had arrived at the place where I and my time stand." (Ges. Schr. 3-446). Applying the searchlight of scientific rules of philology to the pages of the Talmud and investigating it with the critical eye of the scholar, Loew endeavors to prove that the so-called oral tradition of the Mishna from Biblical times is untenable. "The notion of a precisely fixed paradosis must give way to the rules applied by the science of philology, chronology and pragmatic history." (Ges. Schr. I-250). We gladly acknowledge the great merits of Zunz in behalf of the science of Judaism, showing as he does that Judaism was never stagnant, proving the history and development of its literature. But the fact remains that Zunz simply points out how the teachings originated and who the teachers were, what form they assume in the course of time, regarding this he is entirely silent. To him the death of Del Medigo is epoch-making, while the spread of the Zohar, the Shulchan Aruch and Sabbathianism he does not as much as mention. (Ges. Schr. 2-46). The importance of Loew in the service of the science of religion was fully recognized by the master of that science, Abraham Geiger, when he says, "To make clear to our age the inner struggle of Rabbinism and Talmudism, to prove how in spite of all stagnation the latter teachers—and at that not only the philosophically trained ones—had their independent convictions which they did not sacrifice blindly, to prove this, is the very meritorious service which Leopold Loew rendered, the service of strengthening the recognition that in Judaism the free decision has never placed itself under the letter of the Talmud." (Juedische Zeitschrift fuer Wiss. U. Leben. IV.-267).

THE SCIENTIFIC TEMPER OF LOEW.

The scientific temper of Loew was perhaps nowhere more evident than in his attitude towards reform, sympathy for which he has expressed as early as 1839 in his "Die Reform des rabbinischen

Ritus auf rabbinischem Standpunkte." Loew was pre-eminently a historian. While he protested against Creizen and Holdheim who, misunderstanding the spirit of the Talmud, speak aspersively of its teachings he neither could agree with those to whom Talmud was the basis of all authority. (Lit. D. Orients, v. 1844). To him reform upon the basis of Talmudical authority is untenable. "Judaism to-day, divorcing social from ritual conditions, adhering to faith on the one hand and discarding the old national idea has virtually discarded the Talmud and turned its back upon the Schulchan Aruch" (Ges. Schr. 1-25). "To cull a few passages from the Talmud (favoring reform) is not only contrary to scientific standard but thereby you prove nothing, as you can easily marshall other passages condemning reform (Ibid)." It is incompatible with the unbiased mind to misconstrue the honest statements of the Elders of the Talmud so as to make them appear as spokesmen of modern theories, which in all truth were foreign to them." (Ibid). He was not in sympathy with those who declared with the Mendelssohn school that "Judaism does not require creed but deed." (Werke, 3-321), and breaking with all traditions accepted only the Decalogue as the basis of their faith. This, he declared, would reduce Judaism to a dry legalism, which is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Bible and Talmud alike both insisting upon the ethical motive and not only upon mere performance. (Ges. Schr. I-34, 59, 146, 170). Moreover "To maintain that Judaism does not ask belief is as much contrary to facts as it is pernicious (Ges. Schr. I-33). While even at a comparatively recent date claim was made that "The Talmud is the authoritative interpretation of the Bible." Loew shows that many Talmudical laws are based upon faulty hermeneutics, anachronisms and historical mistakes. (Ges. Schr. I-17). To adduce Talmudical authority was according to him, permissible only to show that the rabbinical laws were not always the same. Indeed they underwent changes according to the needs of changed times and conditions. Many institutions, laws and customs of Judaism are not even Jewish in their origin, but are adopted from foreign sources. Especially is this true of Post-Biblical times, when even the literature of the period is polyglott. In antiquity the accretions were from the Greek, Roman and Persian sources; in the Middle Ages from Latin, Arabian and Ger-

man. The national life of the Jew knew to assimilate these exotic elements in a manner that the foreign origin was soon forgotten. But in both periods the tendency is unmistakable—the tendency to reform. In Biblical times the promoter of reform is prophetism, in Post-Biblical times, “*The life surging spirit of the ever rejuvenating Jewish people.*” (Lebensalter 360). “The Jewish middle ages are generally associated with immovable stability. Nothing is more groundless. Not sterility, but on the contrary ever new forms will we meet with.” (Ibid 361). In our days when we hear so much about “Jewish music,” it is interesting to find Loew quoting a man of the Hasidim type,—Joel Ben Samuel Sirkes (1561-1640)—who, when consulted in reference to the melodies of the synagogue which were knowingly borrowed from the church, the Polish rabbi answered, “The borrowed songs are creations of art; they are not composed for the church alone, and therefore they can not be called Christian. (Lebensalter, quoted 313).

AS AN ACTUAL REFORMER.

If we now ask ourselves, what are the actual reforms Loew has introduced, we must answer in disappointment; none whatsoever. Of all that is understood under the term “reform,” there was none in Loew’s time, and there is none to this day, neither in Hungary nor in the entire Austrian monarchy. In the Szegedin or Budapest reform temples, there are no mixed choirs, no family pews, no bareheaded praying, and not even confirmation of boys and girls. As to the contents of the prayers themselves, they are the same as the orthodox have, the only difference being that those of more modern tendencies have a sermon in the vernacular and choral singing. While I was in Budapest in July, 1905, at a Saturday morning service, the organ was mute (on the Sabbath of the pericope of Mattos) it being one of the “three weeks” of mourning for the fall of Jerusalem. In Szegedin even the little pedal harmonium which was used during Loew’s ministry at weddings and school examinations, etc., is not used any more. While you may find in Germany different shades of Reform, from the mildest to the most pronounced radical form, in Hungary we find only the Mannheimer style, *i. e.* sermon in the vernacular and the organ in some few congregations.

Now what is the reason for this lack of progress in Hungary? Why is Judaism stagnant in a country where Marcus Nissa Weiss, Moses Kunitz and above all Aaron Chorin advocated and pleaded for Reform at a time when the German rabbis ten and twenty years later still opposed the reforms introduced by Jacobson and the Hamburg Reform Temple? Why is there no reform in the country where the first reformers lived and where Leopold Loew worked indefatigably for progress?

The reason for this strange aspect is to be found in the cultural conditions and the peculiar linguistic and social divisions that obtain in the land of the Magyars, conditions which are unfavorable to progress. Hence in Hungary there are only two extremes: Blind fanaticism on the one hand and utter indifference on the other. Of reform there is none that is known by that name.

(a) Because the lack of modern schools and the prevalence of "hadarim," which flourish in many localities to this day make progress almost impossible. Such schools as Germany had at the beginning of the 19th century, like the Jacobsonschule at Seesen, the Free School at Berlin, the Wilhelmsschule at Breslau, the Philanthropin at Frankfort, Hungary never had. As late as 1850 the government had to place police at the doors of the Jewish School at S. A. Ujhely, for which a bequest of a quarter of a million gulden was left 25 years previous and the opening of which the fanatics prevented. As late as 1868 the bulk of Hungarian Jews petitioned the State against the Seminary which the government had ordered instituted. Now the result of this lack of proper schools was the absence of an educated laymen class, such as composed the Meassefim or the "Society of Friends of Reform." Schoengeister, like Joel Loew, J. Satanow, L. Zunz and M. Moser, Hungary never had. And having had no educated laymen, Hungary had no reform. For it is an indisputable fact that reforms in the service have never been introduced by rabbis, but laymen. Jacobson was a layman; the leaders of the Hamburg Reform Temple were laymen; the Frankfort Society of Reform were laymen, and all were bitterly opposed by the Rabbis, who never took the initiative to inaugurate reforms. (See Reform Movement, 35, 46, 162). At best the rabbis endeavored to find justification for the reforms that were already in practice, but they never inaugurated any.

Neither Geiger nor Einhorn nor Holdheim did ever introduce any reforms, bold reformers as they were in theory. Geiger, in the famous Tiktin affair, takes the standpoint that "a rabbi might as a critical student declare against the validity of some or many practices in Judaism, and yet in his activity as a rabbi he must observe them (Ibid 83). Again, in his "Gutachten" the prayer book of the Hamburg Reform Temple 1842, and at the Frankfort Conference in 1845, Geiger proves most learnedly that there was no objection against the use of the vernacular in the prayer. Yet when writing a prayer-book for the Breslau congregation he says in the preface thereto: "The significance of prayer consists not only in their contents but also in their form, in the traditional verbiage, hence in the Hebrew language." (Year Book U. C. A. R. XX 267). The credit for innovations, therefore, belongs to the laymen. Hungary, however, not having such a laymen class, has no reforms to this day.

(b) Then again Hungary had no academically trained rabbis like Germany, where the government required that the rabbis must be graduates of universities. What Hungary did have was Hassidic bigots like Hillel Szikszó, Moses Teitelbaum, Mendele Raczferter, Hershele Litzaker, and above all fanatics like Moses Sofer, who maintains that it is sinful to study Hebrew grammar, or even to speak German grammatically. (See Ges. Schr. 1463; 511). Against Chorin and Loew and a few others, or against the small number of graduates from the seminary, the Pressburg Jeshiba alone—not to mention others—"graduates" every year four to five hundred Bachurim that are void of any other knowledge but the Talmud and thus perpetuate the influence of Moses Sofer and his school.

(c) Again the government in Germany was in the main favorably disposed towards innovations, yea, has in many cases actually ordered the introduction of reforms into the synagogue, such as choirs, confirmation, prayer and sermon in the vernacular, etc., etc. (Ref. Mov. 10 V-15). On the other hand, the Hungarian government was always against innovations, and as late as 1852 ordered the Reform Temple presided over by David Einhorn closed.

(d) Above all, however, the linguistic conditions were not favorable to reform. Hungary is the classic country of a Babel of lan-

guages. Not less than fifteen different tongues are spoken there, and the Jews naturally learn the language of their immediate neighbors; Magyarish, Slavish, Rumanish, Ruthenish, Scribish, Croation, Bulgarian, German, Vendish, etc. The Hungarian Jews, having no uniform language, could, therefore, not maintain a special magazine (Fach-Schrift) or organ for the propoganda of progress and reform, calculated to shape and mould public opinion. The "Ben Chananjah," edited by Loew, could not maintain itself for more than ten years, and as it was, had more subscribers outside of than within Hungary. In Germany, where German is the universal tongue, the medium of intercourse is in German. The orthodox Tiktin wrote his "Darstellung" and Samson R. Hirsch his "Briefe" in German, the language of the people. But who has ever heard of a Hungarian rabbi writing his "Teshuboth" in Magyar? There being no uniform language among the Hungarian Jews, reform, therefore, was retarded. The result, however, is disastrous: apostasy to an alarming extent.

An ardent reformer in theory, the works of Leopold Loew, had no immediate influence upon his own countrymen, though for the student they are of immense scientific value—"hilchasa limeschicha." (Syn. 51).

While others grow more conservative as they grow older, Loew grew more firm in his belief in Reform the older he grew. In his old age, with the burden of years upon his shoulders, he braved the tedious journey from Szegedin to the Synods of Leipsic and Augsburg, in the deliberations of which he took a notable part. (From the Brunswick and Frankfort Conferences, though urged by Geiger and Holdheim to come, he stayed away, owing no doubt to the influence of Mannheimer, who would not accept Holdheim and Hess as colleagues.) Loew's imposing figure, and above all his great learning, made a powerful impression upon the members of the Synod, and when the question came up whether a Jew that does not observe the ritual law may serve as a witness at marriage ceremonies, Loew raised his voice urging eloquently the admission of such witnesses, exclaiming: "Do not be afraid of the Orthodox: they will be careful to shoot arrows at us, well knowing that men of their own party will be hit."

Born the same month, though a year later, than Abraham Geiger, Leopold Loew died the same month, October 13, 1875, a year after Geiger. Eminent while he was alive, of Loew it is especially true that "great men appear even greater when dead than they were while alive." ("Hulin," 7). His memory, indeed, is a blessing to all coming generations.

F

THE HARVEST SERVICE.

BY RABBI DAVID PHILIPSON, D. D.

The chairman has requested me to give you some account of the Children's Harvest Service which I instituted some years ago, and which has revived the observance of the Feast of Sukkot in my congregation. Judging from my experience I am inclined to believe that a similar service if introduced generally will do for the revival of the observance of Sukkot what the confirmation service has done for the feast of Shabuot.

For many years the fact was painfully apparent to me as it doubtless has been to many of you that the observance of our Feast of Tabernacles was falling into a state of innocuous desuetude. The attendance at divine service was noticeably small, especially when compared with the great throngs present on the Day of Atonement five days previously. Neither was the feast observed in the homes. The custom of building booths and living in them for eight days, which in an earlier day was quite general among observant Jews had disappeared well nigh altogether among us in America. The feast had in fact become little more nor less than a lingering survival. The people knew little or nothing of it. And yet it appeared to me that the feast embodied an idea which was still vital, so that if the celebration of the day could be readjusted in some way to our modern life, the eternal idea of thankfulness for the harvest of the year and for God's protecting Providence for which the feast stands could be brought home to the people and the feast revived.

I had noted also that Christian churches here and there were beginning to designate a certain Sunday in the autumn Harvest Sunday on which they held a Harvest Thanksgiving Service. Now, thought I, here are churches introducing a new service because the

harvest idea is so full of possibilities for a beautiful service, why shall not we who have in our religious calendar our traditional harvest feast conduct the celebration of the feast along lines which will make it appeal to our generation? The Feast of Shabuot had been revived through a service in which children played a large part, why not attempt the same for Sukkot? Here then were the elements at hand: the eternal idea of the harvest thanksgiving, undoubtedly the origin of the institution of the feast in far antiquity, the disposition among people to-day to have a service of thanks for the bounties of nature and the interest always felt in a service conducted by children. We held the first service of this kind five years ago; the Temple was thronged, and we have had a similar experience each year since. A large number of colleagues have inquired of me concerning the service, and I believe it has been introduced in a number of congregations besides my own.

Let me now give a brief description of the service and such other details as may be necessary.

The pulpit and platform of the temple are decorated with fruits, vegetables and flowers appropriate to the season. A small sukkah is built on the platform and beautifully decorated. After the Sukkot evening service (our celebration usually takes place on the eve of the feast) all the children of the school enter the temple singing a processional hymn of praise. The procession is headed by four of the larger boys each one of whom carries one of the four traditional Sukkot plants, the etrog, the palm branch, the myrtle and the willow. These are followed by the children of the schools according to classes, beginning with the youngest. The children of each class carry an offering of some kind. One class apples, another pears, another corn, etc., etc. The sight afforded by the children entering the temple singing and bearing fruits is inspiring and the effect indescribable. The center of the temple is reserved for the children who all sit together. The exercises open with a service of songs and responses. We have been using Moses' Hymnal which contains an appropriate service of this kind. The four boys bearing the Sukkot plants then come to the pulpit and standing in the Sukkah, recite these lines together:

Here in the Sukkah, frail tent, we stand,
Emblem of God's Providence in desert land.
In trouble sore, in darkest strait,
Our God watches o'er us with mercy great.

With thankful hearts these fruits we bring
To Him whose praise our lips do sing.
Four beauteous plants from earliest time
Our fathers have offered in every clime.

The etrog sweet, of perfume rare,
The palm branch too, so tall and fair,
The myrtle fine, with flow'ret lovely,
The willow meek, its branches lowly.

On this, our happy Feast of Joy,
God's goodness praise without alloy;
To Him aspire with grateful heart
Who all these mercies for us has wrought.

These boys now deposit their fruits on the altar.

Class by class then ascend the platform. A small number of the class (six, eight or ten, as the case may be) recite some lines descriptive of the offering they are bringing and then the whole class joins in a chorus. Upon descending from the platform each child deposits its offering. The words spoken by one class will suffice as an example. The class bearing the corn-stalks speak these lines through their representatives:

America, from thy broad breast
Corn sprang, beneficent and bright,
Of all the gifts from heaven the best,
For the world's succor and delight.

Then do it honor, give it praise;
A noble emblem should be ours:
Upon thy fair shield set thy Maize
More glorious than a myriad flowers.

And let the States their garlands bring,
Each its own lovely blossom sign,
But leading all, let Maize be king,
Holding its place by right divine.

The chorus is then spoken by the whole class:

Praise to God, immortal praise,
For the love that crowns our days,
Bounteous source of every joy,
Let Thy praise our tongues employ.

For the blessing of the field,
For the stores the gardens yield,
All that liberal Autumn pours
From her rich o'erflowing stores.

After a song by the whole school accompanied by the organ, a special Sukkot prayer is read by one of the children of the post-confirmation class. Hereupon another song is sung by the school, and then a thanksgiving psalm is read from the Bible by another of the older children. This is followed by the flower offering. Girls bearing bouquets of autumn flowers ascend the platform and after speaking the beautiful lines, "Oh, painter of the fruits and flowers," lay the flowers on the pulpit. The evening hymn then sung by the school, precedes the thanksgiving offering. A number of girls carrying cornucopias filled with fruits and vegetables speak in chorus a thanksgiving poem whereupon the rabbi preaches a short sermon appropriate to the occasion. The song after the sermon is the national hymn led by the children of the smallest class who ascend the platform and is participated in by the school, the choir and the whole congregation. The service closes with the reading of the Alenu and the Kaddish from the Union Prayer Book. The children now leave the temple singing En Kelohenu as they pass out, whereupon the congregation is dismissed with the benediction.

This Children's Harvest Service is now a feature of our congregational life. It also serves as a beautiful opening of the

school year as the Feast of Sukkot usually falls at the time when our religious schools open.

The revival of our traditional harvest festival through a service of this kind is an excellent illustration of the possibilities of our reform movement, which aims to adjust our religious ceremonies and practices to the modern view and outlook. The harvest service is as significant for the Jew in the United States as it was for the ancestor in Palestine, but the ancient method of observance is not possible now; hence let the observance be changed if thereby we can retain the fine purpose of the feast. Dwelling in booths is not feasible to-day under the conditions in which Jews live in this country; even the service of the synagogue was not sufficient to keep the feast a living reality. In my congregation we feel that we are now bringing home to our people the observance of the feast, for in place of the small attendance on Sukkot with a languid interest in the service we have great congregations vitally interested and impressed. We have a real harvest service in which the old and the new are blended; for the harvest now as of yore calls forth feelings of glad thanksgiving and words of praise and gratitude to the giver of all whose providence protected our fathers in the wilderness and through all the ages for,

Behold, He slumbereth not nor sleepeth, the Guardian of Israel.

NOTE: Rabbi David Philipson has kindly consented to furnish copies of his Harvest Service to all who desire to use it. He should be addressed at 3947 Beechwood Avenue, Rose Hill, Cincinnati, Ohio.—*Editor*.

G

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL FOR JEWISH TEACHERS
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE JEWISH
CHAUTAUQUA SOCIETY.

(Central Conference of American Rabbis, St. Paul, July 4, 1911.)

DR. HENRY BERKOWITZ.

At the request of the Special Committee, I will present to you the thought of the proposed Correspondence School. You know that within the last quarter of a century this new method of conveying instruction has grown far beyond the anticipations of the educators who instituted it. At present the greatest organization of the kind seeking to convey instruction to the multitudes by popular methods through direct correspondence with individuals, is the well known International Correspondence School. I had occasion to visit that institution in the City of Scranton, Pennsylvania, and to become thoroughly familiarized with its history and its methods. This is the one institution that has succeeded in making education not merely self-sustaining, but a paying proposition, something which even our universities have yet to learn. Various universities have taken up the correspondence idea; notably, the University of Wisconsin (which has pushed it more strongly than any other), and the Chicago University under the Rockefeller foundation. They are carrying out the old idea of study *in absentia*, putting students in direct communication with the professor. The student has the advantage of selecting and getting the individual attention of the professor in his special branch of study. By this plan, no student is able to shirk any work. He must do all the work himself. The individual thereby gains a great advantage in many respects, over the attendants in the class direct. Now, that method has been taken up by many and various or-

ganizations. I have a list of some of them here. Their publications I have secured, and for a number of years have been posting myself on the methods followed, with the idea of carrying out the proposition which is to be presented to you now.

This new method of education lends itself to practical application to the needs of the Jewish people in the United States. With the distribution and expansion of our growing constituency and the growth of religious schools throughout the country, in the cities, towns, villages and hamlets it is entirely out of all range of possibility for our teachers to conduct their most serious and responsible work of training the next generation, unless we come to their individual aid. Foundations for this purpose have been created. The Teachers' Institute of the Hebrew Union College and of the Seminary of New York, and the Gratz College of Philadelphia are able to reach only those who are residents of these cities. They have not yet been able to devise any method of reaching those hundreds and hundreds beyond, in the country at large.

In order to raise the standards of teaching in our schools, we must have recourse to some practical method of reaching those who shall never be able to attend these colleges. The colleges are all making earnest attempts; they are all in the inception of a new movement; we must have patience with their work; I believe they are doing the best they can, but in the meantime, I think whatever is being done by them, we should come to the aid of the teachers at large throughout the country.

Now, at the request of the chairman, I am here to offer to you the plans, as far as they have materialized, of the Jewish Chautauqua Society. It has engaged thoughtfully in the preparation for this very enterprise for a number of years. For fifteen years it has held an annual Summer Assembly. During eleven years these assemblies convened in Atlantic City, New Jersey. A majority of the Jewish people of the United States live on the Atlantic Coast, and so many of them congregate in that famous resort that this fact pointed out the advisability of holding these sessions there. Eventually it became apparent that it would be wise to carry this effort further. Two assemblies were held in the City of Buffalo. Last summer we convened in Detroit. Next week

the fifteenth annual Summer Assembly is to meet in Milwaukee, and the first week in the month of August a similar assembly is to be held in the City of San Francisco for the teachers and others living on the Pacific Coast.

The main object of this Assembly is to bring together the religious school teachers of the country. We have been successfully cultivating a constituency of these teachers, and drawing them year by year to these meetings. A Teachers' Institute has been held at each Assembly, and to this Institute qualified instructors and educators of acknowledged experience and authority have come to give messages to the teachers. Lessons in "How to Teach," with the methods and principles of teaching, have been offered, together with illustrative lessons imparted to classes of children; also exhibits of school appliances, etc. This work has been going on now continuously for fifteen years. It has been followed up through propaganda by means of correspondence, and through the personal efforts of a traveling Field Secretary, visiting the various communities of the land with the express purpose of organizing schools, classes and study circles. These study circles have reached hundreds, I may say thousands of persons, and in most instances the teachers of religious schools have been the ones most interested, and have done the prescribed work most conscientiously. Our work has steadily developed until now we feel the urgent necessity of expanding it into a systematic correspondence school. We are taking the example of those organizations cited, which have pioneered the way so successfully along these lines. For this purpose we have tried to get up a list, and have now probably the largest list in existence of religious school teachers of the Jewish schools of the United States, and have been in direct correspondence with many of these teachers. In our Assemblies this project has been discussed and has met with the enthusiastic favor of teachers who have been in attendance. It is our purpose to utilize the machinery for propaganda which has been brought into existence by the Jewish Chautauqua for carrying on a systematic correspondence work of this kind.

The first need is this machinery of an office, with secretary and assistants. There is no other organization qualified along these

lines to do the work, except it be the Synagogue and School Extension department of the Union. That department is so busy with other enterprises that it has yielded the field to the Jewish Chautauqua Society. Co-operation between existing educational institutions is imperative. To this end a meeting was held in New York City in June, 1910, between Dr. Kaplan of the New York Seminary, Dr. Grossman of the Hebrew Union College and myself for the express purpose of devising some practical plan of co-operation in fostering this correspondence idea. At the present time nothing tangible has come of it. In the meantime the Chautauqua has proceeded quietly to develop the undertaking. The plan is to prepare lessons designed directly for teachers. We shall need lessons in "Pedagogy applied to Religious Instruction," "On School Organization and Class Management." "Methods of Instruction" in the various branches taught also in "History of Jewish Education." For that purpose it will be necessary to appoint experienced and qualified teachers organized into a Faculty. Each Instructor is to have charge of the preparation of these lesson sheets, and be in direct correspondence with the individual teachers throughout the country who may enroll for these studies. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations is preparing leaflets and other works, including Teachers' Helps for the classroom. We are in hearty accord with that undertaking and co-operate with it. Our purpose is differentiated from theirs. Whatever the materials adopted for the classroom, we aim to go back of these to qualify the teacher for the proper use of the same. The "Teachers' Helps" may do this in a measure, but necessarily fall far short of the systematic instruction through direct personal correspondence with qualified instructors. Already we have a very well planned Hebrew Course which has been worked out on the correspondence method. The first book has gone through four editions, and is widely in use in the United States for teaching the elements of Hebrew. A second course book, issued several years ago is arranged and printed on the correspondence method. It has lesson sheets for the individual learner in Hebrew. It gives exercises to change Hebrew into English and English into Hebrew, and the elements of Hebrew grammar.

The Society all these years has been carrying on a general correspondence with circles and individuals. I wish you could see the interesting letters seeking fuller information, which come into the office in the course of the year from all sections of the land.

Our courses in Bible study have been through several editions, and though designed for circles, may be very readily rearranged for use on the correspondence plan. Another series of course books prepared by Prof. Gottheil, and one by Dr. Harris on Post-Biblical History and Literature can be readily fitted into this scheme of direct correspondence with individual teachers. A course in the study of the Jewish Religion based on the excellent compendium by the Rev. Morris Joseph of London, "Judaism as Creed and Life" has been issued. The author of that book has himself prepared the course-book. By the preparation of the necessary lesson sheets it can be fitted into this scheme. The preparation of a detailed curriculum as the basis of the Correspondence School has engaged my thoughtful attention for a number of years, and I am pleased to say it is almost ready for use.

We aim further to serve as a feeder to existing institutions by cultivating sentiment in the country at large: by imparting knowledge and stimulating young men and women to engage in the noble and responsible task of teaching. We hope to be able at some time to have scholarships of large enough funds to enable individuals, who have shown their ability, to attend the Teachers' Institutes either in Cincinnati, New York or Philadelphia, in order that they may get the diplomas offered by these schools.

The general object of this plan is to standardize the teaching profession among us. At the present time we have no standard. We are obliged to take such individuals as teachers who may be willing to give of their service and their time out of the kindness of their hearts. They may be qualified Normal School graduates, but devoid of the special training demanded of teachers in the religious school. Therefore it is necessary to do something practical, in order that we may enable our School Boards when they are confronted with the problem of electing teachers, to fix standards. If the Correspondence School is established, the School

Boards will then have the moral backing which will enable them to say, "No teacher who can not show a certificate of proficiency shall go into our school." That will raise the requirements and enable congregations to get something for their money where they pay their teachers.

From this general statement you will have a sufficient idea, I hope, to see what our Correspondence School aims to do. If we can get the concurrence of the rabbis, the backing of the teachers, and a sufficient amount of money from friends of Jewish education in the United States, I see no reason why this correspondence idea may not be put into very speedy operation.

H-1

THE PROBLEM OF ETHICAL INSTRUCTION IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY RABBI TOBIAS SCHANFARBER.

The far reaching interest in the subject of Ethical Instruction in the public schools is clearly apparent from the extensive literature it has called forth, no less than three hundred volumes and pamphlets bearing immediately or more or less remotely on the question having been published during the last twenty years, that is an average of fifteen volumes for every year.¹

France was the first country in the western world to have incorporated in its education laws a statute requiring moral and civic instruction to be given in all its primary schools. This law was passed in 1882, and still crime has been steadily on the increase in France, plainly evidencing the fact that knowledge does not always eventuate in virtue.² Advocates of direct, didactic moral instruction in the schools might do well to remember this fact. The schools should make it their purpose to create moral habits, rather than to impart moral knowledge.

In America Professor Felix Adler was the pioneer, who agitated for the introduction of moral instruction in the public schools. His program for a non-sectarian morality, a morality without the religious sanction is laid down in his book:—"Moral Instruction for Children," published in 1892.

¹For an extensive bibliography, see Religious Education Journal, February, 1911, pp. 718-732, prepared by Mr. Henry F. Cope, General Secretary of Religious Education Association.

²One French teacher reported that her best scholar in Ethics was the biggest knave in the lot.

³Important deviations from the work as therein outlined have been deemed advisable by the Society for Ethical Culture of New York since its publication.

As a direct influence emanating from the Ethical Culture Society of New York, the Moral Education league of London owes its existence. It was organized in 1897. This organization is quite active and is doing much propagandistic work along the lines of having ethical instruction introduced into the schools of the British Empire. It has created a considerable literature for school instruction and has employed Mr. F. J. Gould as a traveling demonstration lecturer for the instruction of teachers. It has made some provisions for moral instruction in the public elementary schools of England and Wales and is extending its propaganda into Scotland and Ireland and other countries. It was the moving spirit that called into being the first "International Inquiry into Moral Instruction in Schools." This investigation resulted in the publication of two important volumes of reports, which appeared in 1908. It also sponsored the "First International Moral Education Congress" held in London the same year.⁴

Among the most important educational bodies in America to-day are the National Education Association and the Religious Educational Association. At the annual meeting of the latter body held at New York in February of this year, the conference on the Moral Phases of Public Education passed a resolution to the effect that, "direct moral instruction varying in content according to conditions systematic or otherwise according to preference be employed as a means of moral education with the special object of developing the power and habit of moral thoughtfulness."⁵ The prevailing sentiment of the convention seemed to be in favor of direct moral instruction in both the elementary and high schools. But in a private conversation which I had with Mr. Henry F. Cope, general secretary of the Association, he volunteered the information that a large number of letters had been received at his office in which members modified the stand which they had taken while at the meeting and declared for the indirect method in the elementary schools and the direct method in the high schools, and this, according to his statement, is the prevailing attitude at the

⁴See article by Harold Johnson, Secretary of Moral Education League, London, in *Religious Education*, February, 1911, pp. 704-708.

⁵For other resolutions, see April number, *Religious Education*, 1911, pp. 117-118.

present time. The rapidity with which educators change their opinion on this subject would indicate their uncertainty in regard to the entire problem.

The National Education Association which is composed of 7,000 active members and 11,000 associate members has for the past several years incorporated into its resolutions recommendations that "the moral development of the children be the primary aim of the schools."

As a further development of the idea of moral instruction Milton Fairchild, a graduate of Andover Theological Seminary, has hit upon the novel scheme of presenting moral ideas to children by means of stereopticon views. To further his purpose he has organized a corporation known as the "National Institution for Moral Instruction," and proposes to secure the teaching of morals in the schools by means of illustrated lectures. A number of schools has already planned to adopt this method.

This brief survey will convey some idea of the steps that have thus far been taken to introduce moral instruction in the schools of both this and other countries.

In order to make the treatment of this subject as concrete and tangible as possible, I addressed a questionnaire to a number of Chicago Clergymen as well as others whom I knew were interested in the solution of the problem. The questions asked were as follows:—

Are you in favor of Ethical Instruction in the public schools?

If so, do you favor a regular course of instruction or shall the instruction be merely incidental to the school activities and in connection with the other subjects already taught?

If not, what is your objection to same?

Do you believe that ethical instruction should ever be given without the religious sanction?

Of the six replies that we quote, all with but one exception are in favor of ethical instruction with the religious sanction. One favors ethical instruction, but is opposed to the introduction of religion in any form into the schools. Of the five that favor ethical instruction with the religious sanction two refer to the difficulties involved in the matter, because of the non-sectarian character of our public schools.

Bishop C. P. Anderson of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Chicago says:—"You ask hard questions. Speaking broadly and theoretically without taking stubborn facts into consideration. I am in favor of ethical instruction in the public schools, of making it a specific course, and resting it on the sanction of religion. But you are aware of the difficulties. So far as the religious side of it is concerned we have to deal with four elements, the Hebrew, the Catholic, the Protestant and the Secularist. The Supreme Court has decided all sectarian teaching unlawful. What is sectarian teaching? Are the Ten Commandments sectarian? Is the Lord's Prayer sectarian? Is prayer in the abstract sectarian? If all religious teaching is sectarian, must we divorce ethics and religion in instructing the young? I do not know any subject that is so perplexing. Somehow we must keep together those things which God has joined together and secure at one and the same time the educational values of religion and the religious values of education."

It is plain to see that Bishop Anderson understands the implications of his position and that if he were to try to put them into operation he would come into direct conflict with the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. Theoretically we are not forced to take stubborn facts into consideration, but practically we are. The rationalist, secularist and the agnostic hold that the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer and prayer in the abstract are sectarian. It is true that they are in the minority, but in a secular state the rights of every citizen must be respected and every attempt on the part of the majority to disregard the rights of the minority would be inexcusable. The Jews regard such prayers as are offered up at graduation exercises sectarian in that invariably they are directed to Jesus. Indeed the Catholics regard these prayers as sectarian. This was evidenced by the recent action of the Catholics of Belvidere, Ill., when Father Joyce of that city under advice of Bishop P. J. Muldoon of the Rockford diocese, protested against the Rev. W. T. McKee, a Presbyterian clergyman, offering up prayer at the graduation exercises of the Belvidere High School. Father Joyce notified the Board of Education of Belvidere that if the prayer were given he would apply to the courts for an injunction restraining the same.

The prayer was not given. The action of the Catholic Church has created much hard feeling and the Protestants of the graduation class absented themselves on the evening of the graduation exercises and held a graduation of their own.⁶ In discussing the Belvidere incident, Bishop Muldoon said, "the law on the point in question is clear and good citizens should be willing to abide by the decision and not attempt to force religious exercises on Catholics."

Bishop Anderson would like to keep together what God has joined together, that is ethics and religion. We have the right to keep these two agencies together in the home, in the Sunday-school and in the Church. We have no right to form an alliance between them in the secular school.

The Rev. Frank W. Gunsaulus, president of the Armour Institute, of Chicago, and spiritual guide of the Central Church, also favors ethical instruction in the schools based upon the religious sanction, but knowing what this would imply he relies mainly upon the personal ethical influence of the teacher as the source of moral inspiration for the pupil. Dr. Gunsaulus writes:—"I believe that ethical teaching in public schools must proceed most largely now from the character that is the personal ethical influence of the teacher. I do not see that it is possible to make our instruction what it ought to be—that is base it on religious sanctions. I think all our religious forces should unite in teaching all we can in every school and making no general rule. In this way it is possible to have in every school the basic things of the ethical life and especially that which shall conserve the child's purity and nobility of character."

Father McGavick of the Holy Angels' Catholic Church of Chicago, gives his opinion as follows:—"I presume you use ethical in the sense of moral. If this is the case, we claim that all true ethics are founded on religion. Religion should occupy a prominent place in educational matters. It should not be merely incidental, but should consist of a regular course of instruction. I consider that the main cause of irreligion of the age and all its necessary consequences is largely due to the want of religious

⁶See Chicago Record-Herald, June 7, 1911.

education. Father McGavick points to the attitude of the Catholic Church on this question as found in the Catholic Encyclopedia.⁷ Here we read:—"Sound moral instruction is impossible apart from religious education. The child may be drilled in certain desirable habits, such as neatness, courtesy, and punctuality, he may be imbued with a spirit of honesty, industry, and truthfulness, and none of this should be neglected, but if these duties toward self and neighbor are sacred, the duty toward God is immeasurably more sacred. When it is faithfully performed it includes and raises to a higher plane the discharge of every other obligation. Training in religion, moreover, furnishes the best motives for conduct and the noblest ideal for imitation, while it sets before the mind an adequate sanction in the holiness and justice of God."

Because the Catholic Church can not have ethical instruction based upon the religious sanction in the public schools, and because the particular tenets of its faith can not be taught there, it has its own parochial schools where such instruction can be given.

It is to be regretted that it is impossible to institute a direct comparison between the children who receive their instruction in the parochial schools and the Ethical Culture schools of New York where instruction in morals is given and those children who receive their instruction in the public schools, to ascertain their relative moral stamina and character. Were such a comparison possible I believe it would be found that the children of the public schools would compare favorably as to their moral standards with those of the parochial schools and the Ethical Culture School of New York.

From the answers thus far given to the questionnaire the demand is for ethical instruction based on the religious sanction. It is but natural that ministers should assume this attitude. It is somewhat surprising to note that Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, Superintendent of the Public Schools of Chicago, takes the same position. Her opinion reads:—"I believe in ethical instruction in the public schools. Most of this instruction should be incidental, but a part should be given in definite form as a regular subject of

⁷See article on Education, Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 5, p. 304.

instruction. While I think that religious doctrine should not be taught in the public schools, I do not think that ethical instruction can be given without the introduction of religion to some extent." If Mrs. Young means by this that she advocates the introduction of "religion to some extent," in the public schools, she is enunciating strange and dangerous doctrine. If religion in connection with ethical instruction may be introduced into the schools "to some extent," why not to all extent? If it may be introduced to any extent, would this not mean an encroachment upon the secular character of our schools?

The Religious Liberty Association, composed of members of the Seventh Day Adventists, has consistently fought every attempt to bring about an alliance between Church and State. It is even now using all its efforts to defeat the Johnson Sunday Law for the District of Columbia pending before Congress.

The secretary of that organization, Mr. T. K. Russell, while favoring ethical instruction in the public schools takes a diametrically opposite stand to that taken by Mrs. Young. He is opposed to the introduction of religion into the schools in any form whatsoever. He says:—"We have never objected to what is denominated strictly ethical teaching in the public schools of our land. We believe that it is within the province of the state to impart to the students in the public schools that character of instruction which will make for good citizenship. That is to say that the State can rightfully teach morals as touching our relations with each other. The student can be properly taught a regard for the life, property and character of his fellow-citizens. In short, he should be taught all those things that would produce honest, noble and upright citizens. When this has been done, the state has reached its limit in the matter of instruction along ethical lines. The very moment that the state incorporates into her teaching any duty respecting things of a dogmatic or religious nature, she has gone beyond her legitimate sphere."

As the last opinion I give that of Miss Jane Addams:—"If we were sure that every child had ethical instruction with the religious sanction chosen by his parents I should favor that ethical instruction in the public schools, be not "incidental," but "prac-

tical" as it were attaching the instruction to situations which arise in the life of the child in the school. On the other hand there is something to be said for family teaching and ethics because I find that children themselves often desire something put in that way."

If I understand Miss Adams correctly, she seems to intimate that it would be advisable to have ethics taught in the schools under the supervision of the different religions and different denominations attending them, for it is in this way alone that the religious sanction chosen by the parents could be given a place in the schools. Aside from the fact that this would be bringing together Church and State, it would be a rather poor arrangement to have the different clergymen coming to the schools for a few brief hours during the week while the rest of the time the children would be under the influence of teachers whose teachings might be in entire conflict with that of the clergymen. It is hard to see one's way clear in endorsing a compromise of this kind.

Miss Addams in referring to the teaching of ethics in the family has emphasized a fact of the first importance. We do not begin at the proper source. We need to give the parents instruction in ethics before we begin with the children in order that the parents might be able to set the proper example and give the proper instruction in the home. We should moralize and religionize the homes before we speak of moralizing and religionizing the schools. The religious sanction which has no place in the public schools should be made pivotal in the home circle. It is true the State has the right to step in and attempt to make good what the home has failed to do, but we can not expect the schools to rectify in the short time the children are under their care what the home has vitiated during the entire lifetime of the child. After all the work of the school is simply superposition. The home is the central agency that should make for and create the moral and religious life of the child. From the best modern home comes the best modern school.

The whole question of ethical instruction in the schools is still in a vague, indefinite and undefinable shape. We are groping for some common ground, but we fail to find it save as we maintain the secular character of the schools. We can not find it in some

common denominator belonging to all religions, because in reality no such common denominator exists. The book prepared by the "Chicago Woman's Educational Union" known as "Readings from the Bible," in which an attempt was made to gather from the old and New Testament selections which would be agreeable to all religions, would make the poorest kind of a text-book for moral instruction.⁸ That book, in the hands of the teacher whose inclinations were in that direction, would make a most fruitful source for propaganda for the dominant faith.

We can not find the common ground by setting aside a certain time and allowing the followers of different religions to enter the school and permit them to instruct their own children in the particular tenets of their faith, because this would render nugatory the secular character of our schools.

We can not find the common ground in permitting morality to be taught without the religious sanction, for the vast majority of religionists are opposed to having ethics taught that way. To all of these propositions vital objections can be raised, but it seems to me that the least or no objection can be taken to the incidental instruction in ethics by means of the activities of the school life and in connection with the other subjects already taught, and here ample opportunities are afforded to build up the moral life of the child. And this moral training will be all the more effective because it comes informally and without the conscious effort on the part of the teacher or the child. The preachy method of teaching morality is deprecated by a large number of teachers in their reports of the work done at their schools along these lines.

Both Jews and Christian, agnostic and atheist agree that in its ultimate analysis the purpose of the public school is the formation of character and the creation of good citizenship. I believe that

⁸The books most frequently mentioned as text-books for ethical instruction in the schools are *Ethics for Children*, by Ella Lyman Cabot; *The Jane Brownlee System of Ethical Instruction*; *Baldwin's Fifty Famous Stories Retold*; *Baldwin's Thirty More Stories Retold*; *Baldwin's American Book for Golden Deeds*; *Kupfer's Lives and Stories Worth Remembering*; *Dewey's Stories for Home and School*; *Everett's Ethics for Young People*; *Eggleston's Great Americans for Little Americans*.

our public school system of instruction always has had this aim in view. Even though ethies are not definitely and directly taught, it would be a libel to label our public schools, as is sometimes done by narrow credists, as godless and atheistic. For they are always surrounded by a moral and even religious atmosphere, even though these subjects have no place in the curriculum. And what the child needs in the school, as well as in the home, is not so much ethical instruction as it is moral atmosphere, contact with morality in action.⁹ The State law¹⁰ demands of its teachers that they be morally pure and of good character. Retaining their positions is contingent upon this fact. After all the most important factor in the school life of the child is the personal influence of the teacher. One Horace Mann is worth more than all the didactic, moral instruction and all the text-books on morality. The state laws demand that the pupils must be moral. If they are not they are placed in Parental Schools and Schools for the Delinquent. In several States of the Union to maintain the democratic character of the schools the ban has been placed upon the fraternity secret society. The schools have ample opportunity to create civic pride and to appeal to the patriotic side of the child's life by means of the patriotic holidays which they celebrate, such as Lincoln's and Washington's birthday, Thanksgiving and Decoration Day, Flag and Peace Day. All of this would indicate that in an indirect way the schools are providing for the formation of good character and the creation of good citizenship. We can scarcely begin to estimate what it means for higher civilization by the attendance of a child for seven or eight years upon our public schools. The discipline of the schools is a most potent factor in the training of morals. The punctuality and regularity that are demanded, the orderliness and cleanliness that are made imperative, the lessons of obedience and reverence for the rights and feelings of others as human beings that are exacted, the sanctity of property and the necessity for truthfulness which

⁹See Joseph Crooker's Essay on Moral and Religious Instruction in our Public Schools in *Problems of American Society*, pp. 235-244.

¹⁰For State laws on this subject see article by George D. Strayer on "The Legal Aspects of Moral Education," in *Religious Education*, February, 1911, pp. 599-611.

characterize every schoolroom mean more for the development of the ethical sides of the child than all the moral maxims that it might learn by rote.

The Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts, and president of the Religious Education Association for 1910, put this fact most forcibly in his presidential address when he said, "You may put ethics in the most scientific form in school but the boy may learn far more of truth and honor on the playground. You may shut out every word of Bible or God from the class room, but while the teacher—a woman of faith and love and prayer—teaches him you can not shut out religion. More, far more, you may call your schools godless and harden your churches with formalism, but if the boy is going home every night to a home saturated with the spirit of religion he is getting a religious education. . . . We have become so accustomed to the thought of religion in the public schools that we assume that if the schools do not provide it there must be no religion. One might almost as well say that because the public schools provide no breakfast there is no breakfast."¹

This is only another way of saying that "example is more powerful than precept."

One of the most serious difficulties in the way of placing ethics in the curriculum of our public schools is the fact that the teachers have had little or no preparation for such teaching. But the fewest of our colleges, universities, and State Normal Schools have made any provision for the instruction and training in practical ethics. We expect the teachers to pass an examination in the regular school branches before we issue a teacher's certificate to them, but in this most difficult subject of ethics we seem to be willing to permit them to teach without any examination or preparation whatsoever.

Professor W. C. Bagley, director of the School of Education of the University of Illinois, sent a questionnaire to the head of the department of education in each of the colleges and universities listed in the report of the commission of education for 1909-10 (Vol. 1, P. 590) and to the president and principal of each of

¹Religious Education, April, 1911, The American Situation, p. 32.

the normal or training schools listed in the same report (Vol. 1, P. 592). In all 556 question sheets were sent out, of which 160 were returned. Of the 160 who responded 24 gave courses in the Science and Art of Moral Education, 98 did not, and 38 failed to answer. In summing up his conclusions Professor Bagley says:—"Explicit instruction in the principles of moral education is provided for by separate courses in relatively few universities. Such courses are found much less frequently in the normal schools than in the colleges and universities. It is well to note also that a majority of those engaged in the training of teachers for elementary and secondary schools place the greatest emphasis upon school life as a source of moral instruction, although indirect systematic instruction through literature, history and science is also deemed to be of very great importance. A strong minority favors explicit instruction through principle and precept illustrated by concrete cases. The prevailing opinion is that religious instruction in any form has no place in elementary schools."¹²

The February and April numbers of *Religious Education*, the journal published by the Religious Education Association, is devoted almost exclusively to the subject of Moral Instruction in the public schools. Teachers and professors have gathered data as to the work that is being done along these lines in the schools of the various States of the country. There are reports of the schools of New York, California, Massachusetts, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Illinois, Kentucky, Iowa, Missouri, Ohio and Virginia. It is but natural that these reports differ somewhat as to the attitude which is assumed toward this question and as to the kind of work that is being done, but the vast majority of them agrees that the personality of the teachers should be the main moral influence, that the atmosphere of the public schools is moral, and that the school activities should constitute the basis of moral instruction. Time is not permitted me to give the separate summaries of all these States. But I will not go much astray if I take the summary of the report of the State of New York, given by Clarence F. Carroll, superintendent of the schools of Rochester, New York, as typical of all the rest. His summary reads:—

¹²Religious Education, February, 1911, pp. 612-640.

1. "The representative superintendents of the larger and smaller school systems of the State of New York apparently in the ratio of about five to one express themselves as not favoring formal training in morals in the public schools.

2. "Many miscellaneous practices in the schools are mentioned as prompting moral training, such as reading of Scriptures, singing, the teaching of biography, history and literature, the reading of good books, the telling of stories, and rewards for perfect attendance. These superintendents with practical unanimity agree that the personality of the best teachers is the strongest possible moral force.

3. A small but very thoughtful company comprising the minority express themselves as in favor of giving some small amount of time and a definite place on the program to some systematic form of moral training and a very small minority recommend either a system or a text-book in morals.

4. It is only fair to infer that the testimony of these superintendents would imply that the modern public school at its best is a powerful moral instrumentality. Pupils are required by the laws of the State and by the rules of the School Board to be regular in attendance, to be prompt, industrious and obedient and to attend school for at least seven years, while a large percentage actually does attend public schools for a considerable longer period. The most striking feature of the positive evidence in favor of formal moral training seems to be its paucity and the timidity of those who speak in its favor.¹⁸

Accordingly it is my conviction that only such moral instruction be given in the public schools as is incidental to the school activities and such as is in connection with the other studies already prescribed in the curriculum.

I must here refer briefly to the subject of social and sex hygiene. There is a strong, growing sentiment to incorporate the study of this subject in the curriculum of the public schools, but the same disagreement that we find as to the question of ethics in the public schools is found in the discussion of this question. Professor Charles W. Elliott, president emeritus of the Harvard University,

¹⁸Religious Education, February, 1911, pp. 641-642.

favors its introduction. He has advocated it in a number of public addresses and at the recent meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction held in Boston, he championed its cause. Dr. Richard C. Cabot¹⁴ opposed the view of Dr. Elliott on the floor of the Charities Convention. He said:—"If these social evils are due to ignorance why are there so many morphine users among medical men? I think the ignorance of sex hygiene is perhaps less than is supposed."¹⁵ The Chicago Vice Commission that recently investigated the vice conditions and the social evil in Chicago in one of its recommendations urges the "appointing of a committee to investigate thoroughly the advisability and methods of teaching social hygiene to the older pupils in the public schools."¹⁶ The Conference on the Moral Phases of Public Education of the Religious Education Association at its meeting held February 17, 1911, recommended the following resolution: "That we approve of the greatly increased emphasis in the teaching of the biological sciences laid upon personal and institutional hygiene and in particular upon sex hygiene and Eugenics."¹⁷

Professor G. Stanley Hall discusses the question in the June issue of *Religious Education* and advocates its introduction into the public schools and that the children be instructed in sex hygiene at an early age. When he asks by whom this instruction shall be given, he answers: "By the physicians with their horrid array only to individuals in special need. Most physicians know very little indeed of the practical psychology, pedagogy or hygiene of sex. These topics are not in the medical curriculum and even venereal diseases are little stressed in the medical schools. This teaching should be given by parents if possible, especially by mothers to daughters, but only very few parents are competent, and most of the wisest fathers find that sex shame makes it hard to speak out plainly enough to adolescent sons. Hence it is up to the

¹⁴Dr. Cabot is the father of the movement looking toward the care of the convalescing poor by nurses in the homes of the patients, after they have been dismissed from the hospital.

¹⁵See Chicago Daily Tribune, June 9, 1911.

¹⁶See the Social Evil in Chicago, p. 63.

¹⁷Religious Education, April, 1911, p. 118.

teacher and clergyman in a large majority of cases to enlarge their function and fit themselves to be guides to the rising generation."⁹

If the parents and the physicians are incompetent and unsuited because of their lack of training to give instruction on this subject what shall we say of the public school teachers and even the clergyman?

In the very same issue of *Religious Education* in which G. Stanley Hall discusses this question it is discussed by Dr. J. H. McCurdy, of the International Young Men's Christian Association Training School, and he takes the exact opposite view. He says: "I would give no formal instruction in personal purity if I could avoid it. Instruction in hygiene should be directly related to the activity of the boys. . . . I would minimize definite sex or moral instruction for boys and emphasize the formation of habits." Dr. McCurdy refers to the fact that knowledge does not always bring virtue. He says: "If this were true students should be the most virtuous class in the world. Boys and young men are not scared by the dangers of the venereal peril as they are supposed to be. The medical students of this country are a standing refutation of the ideal that knowledge brings fear and fear brings virtue."¹⁰ Dr. McCurdy quotes Dr. Richard Cabot, who in an address on February 3, 1911, before the American School Hygiene Association on the Problem of Teaching Sex Hygiene said, that "he had noticed no diminution of venereal diseases at Harvard since the introduction of sex hygiene. I use Harvard as an illustration because the instruction has been most careful for a larger period of years than in any other university." A similar opinion was expressed to me personally by Dr. Frank J. Besley, a prominent surgeon of Chicago. He has a sister who is principal of one of the country schools of the state of Illinois. The question was being agitated there to introduce the subject of sex hygiene in the schools. She asked her brother's advice in the matter, and he advised her to oppose such introduction with all the power at her command. He pointed to the fact that none knows the dangers of the sex question and venereal perils better than medical students.

⁹Religious Education, June, 1911, pp. 152-159.

¹⁰Religious Education, June, 1911, Hygiene and the Boys, pp. 188-192.

and none takes less heed of them than they. We fear that the teaching of sex hygiene would demoralize rather than moralize the school children. It would increase the pruriency in them rather than check it. Professor Shailer Mathews touches upon this subject in his paper "A Call to American Parents."²⁰ He says: "We hear a vast amount of advice to the effect that children are to be taught the mysteries of sex. There are few subjects more in the foreground of some educational philosophies. It almost seems as the sum and substance of the training which parents should give their children is physiological. There is, of course, an element of need here, and this I would not minimize, but I profoundly believe that the maintenance of moral ideas in families will do vastly more for the maintenance of chastity than a perpetual discussion of eugenics. After all, the great principles that build up individuals and nations are not physiological or neurological, important as they may be. A healthy virtue never rests finally on a healthy body. We are still souls, even though we may have lost the definition of what souls are. It is a mistake to teach boys and girls to substitute physiology for the decalogue. Lives grounded in moral idealism withstand temptations far better than lives which have been taught a prudential chastity. Though parents have the tongues of physicians, and though children know all sex mysteries and have not cleanness of mind it profiteth nothing and cleanness of mind is caught not taught." It is here again the question of example being more powerful than precept. It is again the question of the training of the will. We may have full knowledge of all the evils of humanity and if we have not the will power to resist them our knowledge will avail us little. Physicians know the evil effect of the morphine habit, and yet it is a well known fact that ten per cent. of the physicians of the United States are morphine users, through the hypodermic syringe.

Psychologists have not as yet discovered the method by which the will can be most effectively trained. Sex hygiene should be imparted in the home by the parents of the children and not by teachers in the public schools who are poorly equipped to give such

²⁰Religious Education, April, 1911, pp. 49-54.

instruction. If the parents have not the proper knowledge they should acquire it. It is certainly better that parents should open the eyes of their children to the mysteries of sex than that some strange teacher should disclose these matters to the children.

To sum up the contentions of this paper I will put the conclusion in the form of a resolution:—

Whereas, it is the sense of this Conference that ethical instruction should not be given without the religious sanction and, whereas, this Conference believes that the secular character of the public schools should be maintained sacred and inviolable, be it therefore resolved that:

This Conference goes on record as opposed to the introduction of ethical instruction in the public schools, save as it is incidental to the school activities and in connection with the other studies already prescribed in the curriculum and be it further resolved that:

This Conference does not favor the introduction of the study of sex hygiene in the public schools.

H-2

“THE PROBLEM OF ETHICAL INSTRUCTION IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS.”

DISCUSSION BY RABBI MARTIN ZIELONKA.

Has the American school system been a complete success? Upon the answer to this question rests our answer to the problem of ethical instruction. I use the words, American school system, advisedly. We must recognize that the laws governing our “secular” schools are not the same in all states and that the different States never delegated to the central government the education of its future citizens. Were it possible to have truly secular schools, I would agree with the arguments set forth in the paper just read, but we know that this is not a fact. Different States interpret their school laws differently and it is doubtful whether or not, the United States Supreme Court would rule on this question directly.

The Supreme Court of the State of Illinois decrees that the Bible has no place in the school system. The Supreme Court of Texas decrees that singing songs, reciting the “Lord’s Prayer,” and reading the Bible without comment does not constitute religious worship and may be introduced into the schools. Between these two opinions, the decisions of the various State courts can be classified.

These facts are known to all. The question for us to decide is: shall we arraign ourselves on the side of those who believe that all ethical instruction should be indirect, emanating from the personality of the teacher, the order and decorum of the schools and classes, consultation with parents, proper use of library, etc., or shall it be taught as a part of the curriculum in all schools? For those who maintain that ethics can not be taught there can be no problem; their position denies all right to introduce the subject. As soon as we admit that there is a problem regarding ethical in-

struction we admit that our schools are not producing the sturdy characters required by our age, and our question must be, shall we *increase* the methods of indirect ethical instruction, as we have done by manual training, or shall we adopt a system of ethical instruction, non-sectarian in character, that shall appeal to all who have the welfare of childhood at heart?

I know that this involves the religious sanction for ethics, but I feel that we can accomplish more by admitting the necessity for ethical instruction and then impressing the religious sanction for the same in our religious schools, than by continually combating religious instruction. The latter movement is gaining, rather than losing, ground in most States. All are not so fortunate as to have a Supreme Court with the foresight and courage of the one in Illinois.

Our secular schools are a reaction against the priest-ridden schools of the 18th century and as such, are as one-sided as were the latter. Suppressing ethical instruction because the influence of religious bodies and religious instruction had proven baneful, has developed one side of education at the expense of the other. It was, unfortunately, my fate to be present on the American side of the Rio Grande, during the late Mexican unpleasantness. When the first insurrecto army encompassed Juarez and a battle was imminent, the forty thousand inhabitants on the American side of the river were sadly disappointed when the army withdrew and no sanguinary engagement had ensued. The primitive lust for battle could be literally felt in the community. When the army of liberty came a second time and prepared for the assault, men, women and children anxiously awaited the battle. All business was at a standstill. Men were urged to shoot each other, and the masses could be satisfied with nothing less than the flow of blood. Now it is worth noting that a civilized community of the 20th century did not abhor the idea of battle, but looked forward with anxiety for the battle to begin. And this anxiety was more evident among women than among men. This incident revealed a weakness in modern society. Surely something is radically wrong with the result of our educational system, when men and women are anxious for bloodshed and do not consider the heartaches and

sorrows, the widows and orphans, that will result from such a combat.

Education means more than mere instruction, though we are prone to limit it to the latter. In the words of Prof. Dewey: "Education is a process of living and not a preparation for future living." Prof. Hadley in his "Education of the American Citizen," emphasizes "the importance of power as compared with knowledge." If, then, we admit that education means drawing forth all power inherent in the child, we must at the same time admit that every child is more than a memory machine, that he has an ethical nature capable of development, and that it is just as important, if not more important, to prepare this side of life than to fill the mind with facts.

I do not feel that it is necessary at this time to discuss the age at which this training or education shall begin in our public schools. Whether it shall be introduced with the first year at school or later on, must be left to those who make a specialty of child psychology. In the home this training begins with the day of birth, but just when it shall be re-inforced by proper lessons under properly trained teachers is still a matter for debate. I feel that "the child's moral sky can be colored by appropriate stories," and that these will affect his moral development. While I have not had time to ascertain the opinion of leading educators, a large percentage of books on modern school problems point out the need for instruction in morals.

We demand that our teachers be moral and of good character, but we do not inquire into their church affiliation. The school laws of different States declare that sectarianism must be kept out of the schools, yet explicitly point out the need of improving the morals of all children. New Mexico says: "Teachers shall keep all sectarian questions out, but at proper times impress on the minds of pupils principles of morality and virtue, sacred regard for truth, and encourage habits of sobriety and industry." South Dakota decrees that "moral instruction intended to impress upon the minds of pupils the importance of truthfulness, temperance, purity, public spirit, patriotism and respect for honest labor, obedience to parents and due deference for old age, shall be given

by every teacher in the public service of the State." "Utah, Idaho, California, Iowa and Montana speak of moral instruction, but deny the right of religious instruction." "The schools, while they have been guarded on the one hand from sectarian control and specific religious teaching, have on the other hand provided against immorality on the part of either teacher or pupils, and a definite requirement of moral character on the part of the teacher is everywhere enforced." We thus find in many States a lawful basis for ethical instruction while at the same time these States refuse to sanction religious instruction. Should we not accept this condition, admit the need and necessity of ethical instruction that the various constitutions permit, and center our efforts on warding off the propaganda for religious instruction?

State schools are supported for the purpose of creating good citizens. Citizens can only then be good, when they possess good characters. Why then, should not our schools educate directly for good characters? Our churches have not succeeded fully. Revelations in the business world and in municipal government prove that something vital is lacking in the make-up of our citizenship. Our homes, due to the conditions of labor, become, less and less, factors in character building, and we can only turn to our schools if we would replace, to some extent, the former influences for an ethical life. At the same time we must urge the churches to increase their activities in the field of ethics.

Besides this we must not forget the demand of the day is not only for a personal ethical standard, but also for an enlightened social standard. In the words of Jane Addams, (*Democracy and Social Ethics*), "it is well to remind ourselves from time to time that 'ethics' is but another word for righteousness, that for which many men and women of every generation have hungered and thirsted and without which life becomes meaningless." And to quote further from the same book, "to attain individual morality in an age demanding social morality, to pride one's self on the results of personal effort when the times demand social adjustment is utterly to fail to apprehend the situation." It is to meet the need for social ethics that we would urge the teaching of morals in our public schools.

We need not worry about the teachers. If the need is at hand teachers to cope with the situation will be prepared in the training schools. And if special teachers be deemed best then, men fully capable and properly trained for this branch of service will come forward, even as we have found them for all other branches of service.

In conclusion, I would say with Prof. Coe, "morals are not religion and religion is not morals, nevertheless full grown religion includes morals." In our anxiety to keep religion out of the schools let us not prove our excessive zeal by seeking to keep out moral instruction. I feel that much can be attained and finer manhood and womanhood be reared, by allowing our public schools to give instruction in ethics. Our religious schools can then be so organized as to take up the work done the week previous in the public school and giving it *our* religious sanction. I, believe that we should not oppose ethical instruction in the public schools, and I, for one, am ready and willing to try it.

I

SABBATH-SCHOOL WORK FOR HIGH-SCHOOL PUPILS.

(BY RABBI LEO M. FRANKLIN, Detroit, Mich.)

The theme of this paper is one that is of more than passing significance, if for no other reason than that it presumes the fallacy of the theory current until now among many, that Confirmation represents the climax of religious education, and that after Confirmation there is nothing. If we are to deal with high-school boys and girls in the Sabbath-school, we must base our entire plan of work upon the assumption that Confirmation is but a step in the preparation of boys and girls for the really serious educational work of the efficient religious school. This brings us at once to the recently much mooted question as to the proper age for Confirmation.

In what I wish to say to you this morning I am taking the view that entrance into the High-school and Confirmation as the preparation for the serious study of religion, should occur as nearly as possible simultaneously. The average boy or girl leaves the grammar school and enters the high school at about the age of fourteen years. The change from the grammar to the high-school grades is naturally timed to meet the needs of the boy and girl just developing from childhood into youth. It is the time when all the faculties are beginning to awaken; when there is a marked susceptibility on the part of the youth to emotional suggestion; when he or she is keenly conscious of self; when the artistic sense begins to awaken and to show itself in the desire for personal adornment and for the admiration of the opposite sex. High moral ideals are beginning to take shape. It is, accordingly, the time of the teacher's opportunity. On the other hand, it is also the age of self-consciousness, when the child becomes the center of his own universe, and subtle doubt as well as arrogant skepticism as-

sert themselves. At this time, therefore, above all others, right influences are necessary to turn the child into the way of faith. Other considerations emphasize the need of making the passage from the lower to the higher grades in school and Sabbath-school as nearly contemporaneous as possible. While obviously all education must be inherently ethical, so that arithmetic and history and manual training and every other branch must be the vehicle of moral instruction, it is yet a fact that this can best be accomplished if the public school which is rightfully or wrongfully restrained by law from teaching religion, and the religious school, which from its very constitution, is devoted to the teaching of religion as such, can be made to complement and supplement one another both in subject-matter and in method.

In the first place, then, it is my purpose to urge upon the men who hear me, the vital need of encouraging our young people to continue their Sabbath-school work after confirmation, at least during the years that they are students of the high school—that is to say, from the ages of fourteen to eighteen years. This insistence is the more necessary in the light of the altogether lamentable fact that records show that comparatively few are the Jewish Sabbath-schools in which pupils of this age are at all provided for. In some few instances, pupils are kept until they are approximately sixteen, but usually not as students of the Sabbath-school itself, but they are organized into post-Sabbath-school classes of one kind and another, by which arrangement they lose the sense of unity with the younger pupils of the school and the realization that the work which they are doing is but a continuation of that begun by them in the lower classes of the Sabbath-school.

Once it is made possible to hold these older pupils in the Sabbath-school, the question arises as to what we shall do with them. This, however immediately suggests the question as to the purpose of the Jewish Sabbath-school. That fundamentally it is different from that of the non-Jewish Sunday-school, ought to be readily enough apparent, and the seeming identity between the two can only be traced to the fact that we have copied the forms and methods of the Christian institution to such an extent that we have come to believe that our ends and aims are also the same.

Now the fact of the matter is that the Christian Sunday-school is intended fundamentally to be a means of conversion to the Christian faith, and ultimately of salvation. This is not the purpose of the Jewish Sabbath-school. Its purpose is rather instructional, cultural and inspirational. Jews, say what you will to the contrary, are born into their Judaism. If this be not true, must not all the centuries of our martyrdom and our spiritual mastery have been for naught? It is not, then, to convert our children to the faith of their fathers, but it is rather to put into their very souls some measure of appreciation of Israel's ideas and of the Jew's part in the working out of human history, and of the child's duty to carry on that part bravely to the end, that we must strive in our religious schools.

In other words, to use a much abused term, it should be the aim of our religious schools to deepen in the child his Jewish consciousness, and to make him feel the sacredness of Israel's mission in the world.

I have said that the triple purpose of the religious school must be instructional, cultural and inspirational. So far as the first of these terms is concerned, there is certainly nothing novel in it. While we have copied the forms and methods of the religious schools of our Christian brethren, we had schools for the education of the young and old long before the modern Sabbath-school was thought of. The very term "schule" as applied to the synagogue, indicates how close was the relation of learning and worship and how almost identical the function of the synagogue and the school. But the purely instructional side of the religious school may be over emphasized, a danger that comes with the insistence, logical though it be, upon the necessity of introducing into our religious schools the newest and best pedagogical methods. The fact is that while no one with a grain of sense would lift his voice against the instructional part of our Sabbath-school work being carried on in the most efficient manner possible, it is yet true that the mere formal side of instruction can be made so dominant that the cultural and inspirational sides will be lost altogether. This is particularly true in those of our Sabbath-schools—and unfortunately they are yet in the majority—in which the teaching is of necessity

in the hands of the untrained teachers. They con their Bible stories from the Bible or more likely from encyclopedic reference books an hour or two before visiting the class, and then, themselves ignorant of the setting which the particular lesson has in the framework of universal or even of Jewish history, in parrot fashion they repeat to their pupils, sometimes not without glaring mistakes, what they themselves have just read. Naturally the lesson becomes dull and without interest to the pupil, for it can not be gainsaid that at least one-half of successful teaching depends upon the adequacy of preparation and upon the fulness of enthusiasm with which the teacher approaches his or her task. As a result of this condition, children go to Sabbath-school as long as they must; that is to say, as long as their parents compel them to do so, or until they are confirmed—but having no deep-rooted interest in their work, they leave the school when or before they enter the High School where studies and methods are such as to stimulate their interest every hour of the day, and in contrast to which the Sabbath-school work must impress them as being uninteresting and stupid. A wise teacher realizes that when he is dealing with boys and girls of high-school age, in addition to the mere facts which the student can dig out for himself, instruction must have a cultural value. For this reason, religious education in those classes of the Sabbath-school, which are intended for pupils of high-school age, must be planned on broad lines. Because, for instance, just at this age the artistic sense of the child is awakening, the lessons must align themselves with the best that religion has inspired in art, in music, and in literature.

And what part of human history has been so rich in such inspiration as the history of the Jew? Once make it perfectly plain to the high-school boy or girl that Jewish history is not a thing aside from all the rest of human life, but that it is simply part and parcel of the story of mankind's development, and you awaken in him an interest that will hold him to his task and make him eager for more and more. It was James Darmstaetter who said that "No man can aspire to an understanding of world history who is a stranger to the history of the Jew." Now of this fact the teacher must make use both in laying out his curriculum of study, and in

applying it in a concrete way. Emphasis must be laid upon the fact that no man can presume to walk among the cultured and scholarly men and women of his time, who is a stranger to the great part that has been played by the Jews upon the stage of history, and in giving the impetus that he has given to the best in the world's literature, art and music.

And finally, the purpose of the Sabbath-school must be inspirational. This is particularly the case where we are working with boys and girls of high-school age. Susceptible as we know them to be, to the influences that work upon them from without, we must awaken in them as Jews such feeling of pride, such sense of dignity, that they shall leave the precincts of the Sabbath-school eager to do battle in the cause of a faith that has won so many moral victories. Mere dry instruction imparted, as, alas, it has been imparted through so many years in our Sabbath-schools, will never accomplish this. We all know what the "cheder" methods have done in disgusting with Judaism thousands and perhaps tens of thousands of capable young men who might have been a bulwark of strength to Judaism. And though in lesser degree, the methods pursued by many of our Sabbath-schools will surely have the same effect. But it is not because there are not great inspirational possibilities in the Jewish religious school. It is simply because we have failed to realize these possibilities and to employ them to the fullest.

With these facts in mind, I wish to deal very briefly with a suggested course of study for boys and girls of high-school age. Several attempts at making a curriculum have been recently undertaken, but even the latest, that of Eugene H. Lehman, takes for granted that when the child reaches the age of sixteen its Sabbath-school work is forever completed. In this particular curriculum, with which I am sure most of you are familiar, there is many a point with which one might well take issue, but that shall not be a part of my program. I might say, however, in passing, that as I read the book, I find that there is very little that is essentially Jewish in the course of studies as outlined, and even less that might not in all appropriateness be a fairly complete course of instruction in any school devoted to the study of ethics, and social service, without respect to denominational traditions and aims.

A far better piece of work was that done by our colleague, Dr. Simon of Washington, and presented to this Conference some years ago, but he followed the theories of Stanley Hall more closely than an appreciation of the needs of the child would warrant in actual practice.

Perhaps the latest attempt at laying down a graded course of instruction for Sabbath-schools is that recently published by Henry H. Meyer, and edited by Charles Foster Kent. But like most books of this sort, it too is theoretical rather than practical, and is, moreover, of greater practical use to the Christian Sabbath-school whose aims, as I have shown, are entirely different from ours, than it is in the religious school connected with the synagogue.

It is my idea that the proper text-book, above all others, for boys and girls of high-school age, is the Bible. We have been learning so much *about* the Bible and so little of the Bible itself. Therefore, in the first of the four years of my plan, I would include a quick review of the Bible stories, using the Bible itself as a text-book, but with particular reference to the prophets. There is something in the character of those God-intoxicated men in Israel, which invites the admiration of the growing boy or girl, and they are quick to grasp the note of sameness in the message of an Amos of Tekoa, and a Theodore Roosevelt, the great American. In this class, also, I would deal in considerable detail with the Jewish ceremonial institutions of the home and of the synagogue, explaining not only what their original form and purpose was, but what their symbolic meaning may be even to us. I would make clear the difference in origin and in fact between Orthodoxy and Conservatism and Radicalism. This would naturally lead to a study of the Zionist movement, and of the so-called "counter Reformation." The course thus outlined would be ample, not only for one year's work, with pupils of high-school age, but in the hands of a good teacher it could be made to do service for at least two years. I am, as you see, throwing out suggestions, rather than attempting to definitely grade my course.

The special reference to the prophets, of which I have spoken, as part of the first year's work, would lead naturally, to a study of the New Testament in its relations to Old Testament prophecies.

Here the boy would be armed with defensive facts against the typical theological arguments that are directed against the Jew. This would constitute, in the main, the second year's work.

The third year would bring us back very positively to Judaism and what it stands for. In the historical course for this class, I would take up the history of the Jew from the year 1492 until the present time, laying great stress upon the development of reform in Germany and in this country. Closely related to this should be the study of the modern Jew's belief, about God, about the relation of God and man, about Immortality, about the Messiah, and so on. Here too we ought to take account of what the Jew has accomplished in literature, in art, and in music. The Jew as the worker in these realms would again suggest the larger theme of the Jew as the subject upon which the Jew and the non-Jew have written or painted, etc.

In the last year of the four years' course, I would return to the Bible and study, as literature, great masterpieces of that wonderful work; notably, let me say, the book of Deuteronomy, the prophets, especially perhaps the second Isaiah, the book of Job, Ruth and Ecclesiastes. In this same year the children should be given some elementary knowledge of what the Talmud is and the Midrash, and at least a brief survey should be given them of the philosophical literature of Judaism.

The working out of a four years' course for pupils of high-school age is not a Herculean task.

A tremendous field, for the most part as yet uncultivated, lies before us. Of method, I have said very little. One word perhaps at this point might be in place. If there is any time in the Sabbath-school curriculum when the study of Hebrew may be legitimately undertaken, and with the hope of achieving results, it is with pupils of high-school age. I am as well aware as any one that the language sense in children develops very early, but for all that, I know that while the child can logically be asked to study the romance languages at a very early period, it is too much to ask him to take up the study of Hebrew before you would expect him to begin work in Latin and Greek. And so those who believe that the study of Hebrew is essential in the Sabbath-school might

well introduce it for those pupils who have passed beyond the Confirmation class, and in their public schools have entered the High School.

I believe that in these same classes a rather free discursive method on the part of the children is an excellent thing. This has a double value. In the first place, it brings out the independent thought of the child as no other method could do, and in the second place, it puts the teacher and pupil into a very personal relationship which is a thing greatly to be desired. Moreover, it allows the teacher to touch upon many issues which are purely incidental to the lesson; to emphasize social duties, as suggested by the situations that arise in history, and to lay necessary emphasis upon that which above all is essential in Sabbath-school instruction, personal morality and individual responsibility. Debates are to be recommended in these classes, and in fact every form of instruction which will give an opportunity for linking the great personalities and supreme events in Jewish history with the dominant men and movements and incidents of the larger world and more in modern times.

I presume that there will be many who will doubt the practicability of carrying into effect such a scheme as I have suggested rather than detailed, but the only answer that I can give to that objection is that others as well as myself have tried it and it works out most admirably. In my school, the serious work of religious instruction begins after Confirmation. The pre-Confirmation period is but the preparation time in which pupil and rabbi come into that personal relation and establish that confidence one with the other, which will make it easy to go on to higher things.

Personally, I believe that the Jewish Sabbath-school has in it great possibilities, but its future will depend in largest measure upon the success with which we invite and hold the interest and enthusiasm of those boys and girls who are students in the public High Schools.

J

SOME ASPECTS OF JEWISH APOLOGETICS.

BY RABBI MAX C. CURRICK, Erie, Pa.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The task of the modern Jewish apologete is to present to the world at large a true and comprehensive account of Judaism and the Jews, which will offset all misunderstandings and place them in their true relation to the history of the world and of world religion. That is to say, apologetics may be self-contained, and may pay little or no attention to specific attacks, charges or criticisms. No religion, however, can boast so complete and convincing an exposition of its history, its theology and its ethics, as to be able to dispense with the need of apologetics as it is commonly understood as a special department of theology. For this reason wherever apologetics is taught it is from the view-point of defense and polemics. This latter will also be the starting point of this paper, although before beginning a consideration of the particular matters which I have selected, it may be necessary to take up a few more general observations.

There are certain limitations which I shall have to put on this paper in order to bring it within the bounds of my own ability and library facilities, and to make it of any practical benefit to the members of the conference. I shall not, as some writers do, take all Jewish literature as apologetic. For while undoubtedly, in a sense, the contention is valid, it would be equally valid of all religious writings. I shall take for granted the apologetic intent and value of the Ten Commandments and of all the moral laws of the Bible and the prophetic writings.

2. I shall arbitrarily exclude general religious apologetics. This certainly should have a place in a complete account of Jewish apol-

ogetics. Some of our ablest writers, of ancient and modern times, have undertaken to prove the validity of the general fundamental concepts of religion against the criticisms of unbelief, atheistic and agnostic. And there is a Jewish viewpoint in this also. Take for example Benamozegh's *Teologia*, the first volume of which, and the only one I have seen, discusses the God idea. This volume is subheaded *Dogmatica e Apologetica*. Benamozegh is by his own description a strictly orthodox Jew, but his entire argument, though derived from Jewish sources, is a strictly modern philosophic presentation. Even though he does argue also from the traditionally Jewish view-point, I am of the opinion that such apologetics as his in this book for the purposes of this paper need not be taken as strictly Jewish. For I am sure that learned and interesting as it may be, the members of this body do not wish to listen to a summary of the arguments for the existence of God, the design of the universe, the historical and positive arguments for God's existence, the ontological, the logical, the moral and æsthetic, the sentimental, the dynamic or psychical arguments, as Benamozegh presents them.

3. All Jewish apologetics has paid as much attention to attacks against the Jews as to those against Judaism. Both in the past and in the present Judaism has been misrepresented and misunderstood and the Jews have been slandered. Both Christian and Jewish writers have satisfactorily answered the attacks against the Jews, notably in such matters as that of the blood accusation and of the inferior morality not only of Judaism but particularly of the Jews. Again, for the purpose of this paper, I shall not take such writings as specifically Jewish apologetics, even though they naturally and rightly belong in any complete account of the subject.

4. All apologetics encounter the same danger, namely that of being partial and one-sided. True, the apologist always assumes for himself the quality of strict impartiality and honesty. Still as a rule he claims everything and admits nothing. He is able to see very little worthy of commendation in the other religions of the world and in their advocates. The latter he is likely to hold are prejudiced from the very beginning and constitutionally un-

able to discern the truth of his argument and of his religion. It is not strange, therefore, that non-Jewish writers take the same position toward us. We ought consequently to use a greater candor both with regard to our own people and toward our non-Jewish critics. While showing no consideration to the rabidly partisan writers we ought to be willing to admit that some writers who find fault with Judaism may really be as impartial in judging our religion as we are in judging theirs. Unless we are willing to accept the principle of the absolute religion and to give up the idea of development within Judaism, we ought to be prepared to admit faults where they have existed or at least candidly to determine the different stages of our development. In treating the opinions of some of our opponents we should be careful to hold the balances true. What we are willing to admit to ourselves we should not pretend to doubt in a contention with non-Jewish writers.

5. Perhaps a word on scientific method may also not be amiss here. Most of us are perfectly willing to apply strictly scientific method in a discussion of the origin of Christianity and of any of its sects. We make use of all the data supplied by comparative religion. But we are very loth, some of us, to apply the same method to our own religion. In fact strong objections are made when non-Jewish writers attempt to construct a scientific history of the growth of Judaism. Again some of us are perfectly willing to be very scientific in the study of the ancient religion of the Hebrews, but we seem utterly unwilling to admit that outside peoples and religions may have influenced its subsequent developments. The time has come for candor not only with regard to the past, but also with regard to the present. We need not be any the less loyally Jewish because we utilize the best learning in the endeavor to understand the origin and development of our own religion or because we take cognizance of the foreign factors which have influenced its development. Our religious possessions to-day are valuable to us for what they are and for what they have been in the maintenance of the purest ethical monotheism in the history of the world religions. Still the Jewish apologist of the future will probably go full way with Max Muller when he said, "Every relig-

ion had some truth, nay, was a true religion, was the only religion possible at the time," only there may be a slight changing of the tenses and an additional modification of place.

II.

It is not the object of this paper to give a complete history of Jewish apologetics nor indeed to canvass the entire subject of Jewish apologetics itself. Therefore the following historical sketch will be as brief as possible, without slighting, as far as I know, any important portion of it. The older writers on Jewish apologetics usually consider the first period that of Bible times, in which the polemics was wholly internal and directed against the heathenish elements of the life of Israel. It is considered to have ended only with the second commonwealth when Judaism was firmly established and the danger of a relapse into idolatry had passed. Apologetics from the view-point adopted in this paper begins with the second period. It was made necessary by the diaspora in which Judaism came into contact with foreign culture, and the Jews felt the need of defending the religion against ridicule and misunderstanding. The need was felt all over the Grecian world. "Every land and every sea is filled with thee," sang the sibyl. "Everybody is unfriendly to thee because of thy customs."¹ So Israel's defensive and polemic literature grew apace. The Septuagint is the first apologetic work of which we have the complete form. This translation of the Bible which was composed during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (284-247) met the needs not only of the Jews who were no longer able to understand the Hebrew, but it also attempted to present Judaism to the Greek world in such a way as to disarm current criticism. The method of the Septuagint is evidence of the dual purpose. Much which might be offensive to Greek ears is smoothed over. It would be interesting in this place to show that the apologetic view-point was one of the greatest factors in the development of Judaism. At least, here we see the refining of many an old idea. Anthropopathisms are removed and passages which might give the

¹Sib. III. 271-272. (Quoted by Hamburger).

heathen an idea that God was visible in the flesh were paraphrased. The new translation was hailed with delight and became the fertile source of religious development within and away from Judaism. By this latter phrase I mean to refer to the important influence of the Septuagint in the rise of Christianity. The letter of Aristeeas, a proselyte, supposed to have been written about the same time as the Septuagint, probably comes from a writer living about the end of the century. It was really intended for heathen readers.¹

Aristobul's commentary on the Torah comes from about the same time. He not only shows that Judaism contains all of the essentials of Greek philosophy, but proves also that Plato, and all of the other important Greek philosophers, derived their doctrines from Moses.² Systematic Jewish apologetics had its rise in this period. It was stimulated by certain attacks against Judaism and the Jews by many heathen writers. Among these are Manetho (middle of the third century B. C. E.), Apollonius Molon, Lysimachus, Chaeremon (about 50 C. E.) Apion, a contemporary of Chaeremon, besides others who were not specifically answered by Jewish apologists, but something of whom we learn from Josephus and casual references in other writers, such as Posidonius, Diodorus, Trogus Pompeius, Nikarchus, Damokritus and Tacitus, Horace, Juvenal and Martial.³

Of systematic Jewish apologists of the Hellenistic period only two are known to us; the fragment of Philo's "Apologia Hyper Ioudaion" in Euseb. Praep. evang. VIII, 11, and mentioned in his Hist. Eccl. II. 18, 6; and Josephus's "Contra Apion." The latter work we have complete. It is a thorough consideration and refutation of all the charges brought against the Jews and their religion by their enemies, chiefly, of course, by Apion. Many anonymous works were also circulated for the purpose of creating a favorable impression of the Jews and Judaism and for making propaganda for the latter. Chief among those were the Sibylline oracles. Here again Jewish writers used Grecian forms for their own purposes.

¹Schuerer, Eng. Trans. 2nd Division, III. 306 f.

²Ibid. 240 fol.

³Ibid. 249-262.

As Christian writers used the same means, there has been some difficulty in extricating the Jewish sibyls from the mass, although some portions of the oracles dating from the second pre-Christian century are now fairly well determined. The oldest Jewish sibyl dates probably from the time of the Maccabees. From then on the time of their authorship extends down to the end of the second century of the Christian era. Besides the use of the oracular method we have that of spurious quotations from the great Grecian poets. *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Philemon*, *Menander*, *Diphilus* are cited; *Hesiod*, *Homer* and *Linus* are quoted in support of the Sabbath, and a large fragment, supposed by some to be the work of *Aristobulus*, is ascribed to *Orpheus*.

Although we have not *Philo's Apologia Hyper Ioudaion*, which was probably delivered before *Caligula*, and which has been referred to above, enough of his extensive works are still extant in various fragments to indicate that his apologetic activity must have been very effective. *Philo's* philosophy was both Greek and Jewish, indeed, his effort seems to have been to prove their identity. Even his allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch may have had no other purpose than to harmonize the legends of the Scripture with Greek philosophy. It may be in place here to suggest that the allegorical method of the Hellenistic Jewish writers so often mentioned is perhaps not so widely different from the Midrashic as some writers seem to think. In *Philo* it surely does not appear to be far removed from the Midrashic. So it is fair to say that while the writers of this most prolific period of Jewish Apologetics did absorb the Greek spirit, they were in close touch with the spirit of the religious center to which they gave their allegiance.

The apocryphal books which were written during this same period from the second century before to the first century of the Christian era, partake of the dual apologetic character of the sibyls. They are both polemic toward heathenism as well as apologetic for Judaism. Among these books are to be mentioned the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Baruch*, *Bel and the Dragon*, the apocryphal book of *Jeremiah*, and the book of *Jubilees*.

Without mentioning any further particular names of men or literary fragments it remains to be said that the apologetic activity of these centuries also points to a very effective Jewish propaganda. That many new adherents to Judaism were gained is evident both from Jewish records and from the frequent attacks made against Judaism and the Jews by heathen writers. Passages of the Talmud referring to proselytes also confirm this view. These have to do with many of the great Talmudic figures and tell of their success or failure in the making of proselytes. The numerous disputations between heathens and rabbis also indicate the same facts.¹ Before leaving this period it is proper to add that our statement of the dual influence of the Septuagint is borne out by the fact that Aquila, a proselyte, and Theodotion, possibly also a proselyte, thought it necessary to compile other translations of the Scriptures into Greek which would be nearer the spirit of the original. The latter is a revision of the Septuagint, while Aquila's translation is more original. The importance of these various translations is not to be underestimated, for they were widely used. Internal evidence shows that both Philo and Josephus quote the Bible from the Greek translation. While all of this remarkable activity within and without Judaism was beneficial in strengthening the loyalty of the Jewish people themselves and in attracting many to the faith, it was also ultimately very influential in assisting the propaganda of Christianity. But the elucidation of this point does not belong within the scope of the present paper.

With the ascension of Christianity Jewish apologetics had, of course, to turn its offensive and defensive weapons against the new religion. For a large part of the new propaganda consisted in attacking the mother religion. The earlier centuries do not give us any Jewish literature at all. This may be due to the fact that the Jews did not realize the importance of fighting back, since no perceptible inroads were made in their own ranks, or possibly Christianity was so busy with conquering pagan Europe that whatever attacks were made against Judaism did not really come home. When I say we have no literature from the earlier cen-

¹See Hamburger Real-Ency. des. Jud. II. Religionsgespraeche. Frankel's Monatsschrift IV. p. 161, 209.

turies I do not mean to overlook the numerous disputations and polemics of the Talmud and Midrash. But after all, these remnants are scattered throughout the literature and are very scanty. Although we have numerous works of church fathers against the Jews, and although there is no doubt that Jewish scholars were easily able to answer their calumnies and misrepresentations of the Scripture, there are no works of their composition extant. Graetz was of the opinion that replies were written, but have been lost. It is hard to understand that all should have been lost when the bulk of other Jewish literature has been so well preserved. Jewish apologetics, however, took a more aggressive form after Christianity had obtained world power and had begun its policy of persecution and oppression of Jews.

The first real apologetics we have, begin with the tenth century productions, those of Saadia and his contemporaries, rabbinic and Karaitic. These wage war against Christianity and Mohammedanism, and show a remarkable lucidity of thought and presentation. In essentials modern Jewish apologetics has not progressed far from their philosophical and critical view-points. Saadia shows in his *Emunoth W'deothe* the enduring quality of Judaism, al Kirkisani shows that Christianity is the religion of Paul, and not of Jesus. From the tenth century on there was no break in the list of able and fearless Jewish apologetes. They replied to the arguments of the Church fathers and also particularly of the converted Jews with overwhelming force. Although they were made to participate in many so-called disputations, in which they invariably came off victors, they were still not given the fruits of their victories, but were made to suffer hardships and frequent expulsions. It is scarcely possible in a paper of these dimensions to go into any great details regarding the men and the books from the middle Christian centuries down to modern times. They are to be found in Steinschneider's *Literature*, in the introduction to the section of Apologetics of Winter and Wunsche's *Literature*, in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, in the article on Polemics, also in that on Apologists, in Hamburger's supplementary volume containing the article on Disputations. All I can hope to do here is to skim the surface and attempt a survey of the whole literature, as gathered from the sources just mentioned and from a few others.

Jewish polemics from the tenth century and on is contained not merely in separate works, but also in the piyyutim, the later midrashim and in general theological works. These include the polemics against Mohammedanism as well as against Christianity. The polemics against Mohammedanism is easier to sum up because of the fewness of the works extant. Steinschneider¹ has collected a large number of passages in various kinds of Jewish writings which attack Mohammedan doctrine and ward off Mohammedan attack. Yet he knows only one extensive work wholly devoted to polemics against Islam. This is the *Qeshet Umagen* of Simon Duran. It is in reality an elaboration of a part of his commentary on the *Pirke Aboth* and was written in the year 1423. Other writers like Saadia, Jehuda Halevi, Sherira Gaon, Abraham, Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, Moses of Coucy, and the author of the *Zohar* attack Islam only casually. The *Qeshet Umagen* was translated into German by Steinschneider in 1844, but was not published until some time later. All of these also wrote polemics against Christianity. The first large independent polemical work against Christianity was the *Milchamóth Adonay*, written in the twelfth century by the Karaite, Jacob Ben Reuben. With the rise of the Crusaders, and the growth of the Franciscan and Dominican orders and their great use of Jewish converts in adding to the misery of their former brethren, Jewish apologetic writings became both frequent and bold. The converts, being very zealous in behalf of their new faith and often very bitter against the old, used their knowledge of the Bible and the Talmud, or rather misused it to attack their brethren and Judaism. Jewish scholars answered them both in literary compositions and also in the famous disputations already referred to. Among them, to mention only the most prominent, beginning from the twelfth century, were the following: Samuel b. Meir (Rashbam), Joseph Bechor Shor, Joseph b. Isaac Kimchi (in his *Sefer Habbrith*), Moses Ibn Tibbon, who defended the Talmudic Haggada against attacks, Meir b. Simon, author of *Milchamoth Mitswah*, all of whom lived in France. It is also perhaps worth while noting that in France also, namely in Paris, the first public disputation was held in the year 1240, between the converted Jew Nicholas Donin and Rabbi Jechiel, of Paris. Although the latter was victorious, the Talmud was publicly burned at the stake just the

¹Polemischer und Apologetischer Literatur in arabischer sprache. Leipzig 1877.

same. Conditions in Spain during this period were probably worse. Due to the prominence of the Jews in Spain the feeling aroused by the scurrilous attacks against the Jews and the Talmud were very bitter. The first public disputation in Spain took place between Ramban (Moses Ben Nachman) and Pablo Christiani, a converted Jew (1236 C. E.). In his *Wikkuach Nachmanides* reproduces the entire disputation. According to this the chief discussion centered about three questions:

1. Has the Messiah come, as Christians hold, or will he come as Jews believe?
2. Is the Messiah divine or human?
3. Have the Jews or the Christians the correct faith?

In spite of his victory in this debate Nachmanides was driven from the country in his old age. There were other famous disputations which I can here only allude to. Ziegler in his "*Religioese Disputationen im Mittelalter*" should be consulted for a fuller account. (Also see Kohler's excellent article in J. E.) The famous debate between Geronimo de Santa Fe (Joshua Allorqui) and Don Vidal Benvenist, which was arranged at the instance of Pope Benedict XIII took place in 1412. Others which may here be mentioned are those of Moses Cohen vs. John of Valladolid and Abner of Burgos (Burgos and Avila, 1375), Shem Tobh Ben Isaac Shaprut vs. Cardinal Don Pedro de Luna (later Pope Benedict XIII). Accounts of these latter are contained in the books "*Ezer ha-emunah*" and "*Eben Bochan*"; and the long list of more or less authentic friendly disputations which may be found in *Hamburger*.

The polemical writings from this period and later are exceedingly numerous. Dr. Back in his article in *Winter and Wunsche* on the subject, points out that Wolf, in his *Bibliotheca Hebraea* (1721) uses fifty quarto pages to enumerate the mere titles of all publications by Christians against Jews and Judaism. This is instructive as showing the feverish anti-Jewish activity of Christian writers and also as showing that there must have been also a very extensive Jewish apologetic literature. A large number of the works cited are direct answers to Jewish books, and some of our Jewish apologetics, on the other hand, are answers to calumnies of Christians. The charges of the use of blood, of the piercing of the host, of bringing on the plague, of poisoning wells, are among those

added to the older attacks from the twelfth century on. From this time Jewish apologetics appears in all European languages, not the least effective also in Juedisch-Deutsch. They are all concerned with refuting the charges against the spirit of the Talmud, the falsification of the Biblical texts, the correct interpretation of the prophecies, the blood accusation, and other stock Christian polemical arguments. In this short sketch it would be impossible to enumerate even a fraction of the long list. And as I could do nothing more than mention the mere names, it is just as well to refer to the same compilations which I have already cited. (Some of the best of them have been reprinted by Geiger in his *Qobhetz Wikhuchim*, Breslau, 1844).

Suffice it to say that Jewish apologetics from the earliest times until to-day engaged the best Jewish minds. And even in modern times, when the questions of apologetics have varied a little in some respects but not in others, there is scarcely a writer of note who has not at one time or another, taken up some phase of Jewish defense. With the battle for Jewish rights a new element was introduced into apologetic writings, which for a time rather overshadowed the older theological and critical apologetics. Jewish apologists fought for Jewish rights and they still do to-day. However, such apologetics does not rightly come within the scope of this paper. Laterly we have had a return to the truly polemical and defensive apologetics. Modern writers, like Friedlander, Guedemann, Eschelbacher, Joseph, Benamozegh as well as all of the greater lights in German Jewish literature of the past generation, Zunz, Geiger, Philipppson and the rest, have devoted their ability to the consideration of some aspect of Jewish apologetics, from the critical and theological view-points. It is my purpose in this paper to give some of the important contents of these modern writings.

III. TYPICAL MODERN POSITIONS.

The questions of the most modern Jewish apologetics are slightly different from those of the older. The view-points of the older apologetics are practically accepted by modern learning and by the adherents of the liberal Christian sects. I have already referred to the places where a good summary of apologetic literature

may be found. In the summary I have given in this paper, I have omitted to mention the subjects in theology over which the discussions raged, for I have felt that these are so well known to the members of this body as not to require even listing. It is, of course, not to be overlooked that some of the older apologetics is marvelously modern in tone, and although the questions argued are such as modern critical scholarship has practically ruled out, they are very interesting because of the critical and scholarly manner in which they are handled by Jewish sages. Even so delightful an ironic composition as that of Prophiat Duran, Al T'hi Kaabhothekha, which is included in Geiger's Qobhetz, can not furnish the modern view-point. Advanced Christian scholars no longer hold the ancient view-point and they are quite as eager to expose the false exegesis of the prophetic passages which have been addressed as proof of the prophetic expectation of the advent of Jesus as Jewish scholars are. This, therefore, is the task of general Biblical scholarship, and while it must, of course, find a place in any comprehensive work on Jewish apologetics, may be passed over here as an old story indeed to all of the members of the conference.

Our task, then, is to consider the views which have been advanced against those Christian writers, who, in spite of the fact that the ancient Christian bulwarks have been totally destroyed, still maintain the inherent superiority of Christianity and the inferiority of Judaism. That is, where formerly there was the authority of the Church and of the Scripture or of Jesus, there is now advanced the claim of the authority of a higher development. The Jewish answers have been given by such men as Eschelbacher, Guedemann and Friedlander, who devote a wealth of learning and of skill to answering the dicta of such Christian apologetes as Harnack, Bousset, Wellhausen, Stade and others. I call these men apologetes even though they themselves claim to write as historians and to weigh all evidence impartially. But when Schuerer practically brushes aside in a single sentence all the powerful presentation of the Pharisees by Geiger, it can not be said that his attitude is either scientific or impartial.

Modern Christian apologetics of the advanced school like the most modern Christian theology, has greatly simplified the task

of Jewish apologetics. It has receded from the old theological ramparts, no longer bases Christianity on the Church nor on the scriptures, but goes back directly, as it holds, to the life and teachings of Jesus himself. It does not even insist on the divinity of Jesus, and his Messiahship in the older theological sense. For this reason the Orthodox Church, and to me it seems with good reason, strives to take away from them the very name of Christian. For while historically and spiritually they may be related to the traditional Christian church, Christianity, as its etymology alone suffices to show, is either the religion of the Messiahship of Jesus or it is nothing. But this is an altogether Christian question and may be left at this point. But it justifies one observation which is worth stating right now. In going back to the religion of Jesus, in giving up the belief in his miraculous birth and divine origin and nature, in accepting the morality and spirituality of Jesus as the rule of life, there is progress toward Judaism. And progress it should be called. For the Jewish apologete has the comparatively easy task to show that the entire history of Christianity from the time that it took its distinctive form has been but a very slow and irregular progress toward the religion of Jesus, which was, beyond any doubt, Judaism. The entire long story of the evolution of the early, medieval and modern church, is but the gradual sloughing of that heathen garb in which the monotheism and the morality of Judaism were wrapped to make them acceptable to the heathen world. Such doctrines as original sin, the devil, salvation through the blood of Jesus, the trinity, are no longer characteristic of the faith of liberal Christians and it is by way of avoiding them that a writer like Harnack, for example, talks about the Wesen of Christianity. The essence or kernel of Christianity, as he calls it, the valuable and the permanent in the religion, he finds in the life and teachings of Jesus.

Even from this stand the liberal Christian theologian will finally have to recede. For modern scholarship instead of clearing up these two subjects is only making them more obscure. The personality of Jesus and his teachings recede more and more into the region of myth and legend in the light of modern knowledge. Indeed it is a pretty safe hazard to say that the more we learn about

the origins of the New Testament and of Christianity the more certain it becomes that the historical religion of Christianity has little to do with that of the immediate followers of Jesus. When the characteristic doctrines of the religion were adopted, such as the divinity of Jesus, the Trinity and others, the real followers of Jesus and his disciples, that is, the Jewish-Christians of Palestine, who considered him as the Messiah from the Jewish point of view, were branded as heretical and excommunicated from the Church. Again the Gospels are notoriously such poor evidence for historical occurrences or utterances that very few, if any, of the attributed sayings of Jesus are to-day accepted as being in reality his own. Those which are put into his mouth by writers of Pauline tendencies are pretty easily distinguishable. But besides it will be the duty of the impartial Christian apologete or historian of the future to show that any of the sayings of Jesus can actually be traced back to him. That done, the Jew will show that the great stress of Christianity throughout its whole history has been on the miracles and the doctrines of the church of heathenish origin, and not on the unique personality and the high ethical teachings of Jesus. It was Jesus in the heathenish aspect of the Son of God, not in the Jewish sense of that term but as the pagans understood it,¹ who won the heathen world. Even modern, liberal Christianity, dropping these doctrines, still holds to the unique personality of Jesus, for which there is not an atom of historical proof. As Schechter has shown,² it would be easy to construct similar ideal characterizations of any one of a number of rabbis of the same period from the records of their lives and their teachings contained in the Talmud. But in this matter of the authenticity of the gospels, Jewish apologetics can afford to admit a great deal. It could really grant for argument's sake all the midrashim of the New Testament as being authentic and as coming from Jesus. For it could still prove that a schism away from Judaism was probably the furthest thing from his mind.³ I mean it could do so from

¹Eschelbacher, p. 59.

²Some Aspects of Rabb. Theology, p. 18.

³Hamack (see p. 289).

the extant official records of the New Testament. And it would not necessarily have to avail itself of the sayings which are put into the mouth of Jesus by Hebrew Christian writers about the permanence of the law and of his coming to fulfill the law, but rather from that class of sayings which the heathen Christian misunderstood because of their ignorance of the midrashic method. For these writers based their accounts no doubt on the separate logia which came into their hands. From these they built up the fabric of a mythology under which Christianity has been laboring for almost eighteen centuries. Because the logia quoted the prophets they took the prophetic utterances to be definite predictions of the birth, life, passion, and death of Jesus. It is far from impossible that the time will come when even orthodox Christian writers will acknowledge that the original writers of the logia, from which the Gospels and some of the other books were compiled, did not themselves take the scriptures in that way. They were merely quoting Biblical passages in the familiar midrashic method and not as legal citations to prove a case. Even of the alleged sermons of Jesus this is also true. In their present form, thanks to the naivete of the compilers, it is possible to establish that he intended no abrogation of Judaism. I do not say of the "law" because Jesus probably was not acquainted with that interpretation of the word "Torah." To him as to all Jews, Torah meant something vastly more. And when he said in one place or another, "It has been said unto you, . . . but I say," far from abolishing the first clause of his quotation he was really strengthening it. It might be said in rabbinical language, *Jeshua Hechmir*, Jesus was a rigorist. He added to the severity of the precept. Where it was commanded, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," he adds thereto that a man must not even look with lustful eye upon a woman. In the same way he adds to the law of murder that of anger. These and similar additions are made with the familiar phraseology, "Ye have heard that it was said . . . but I say." It would indeed be a peculiar progress which would abolish the laws of murder and adultery in order to establish a higher morality. The same thing is true of the famous "eye for eye" passage. Even Jewish apologists seem to overlook that when Jesus

refers to the law of Leviticus he has in mind the usage and understanding of the law in his day. He could not have been ignorant of the fact that it was not understood or carried out literally, but that a money damage was given for injury. Outside of the impracticability of the law of non-resistance and without consideration of the fact that Christianity has probably been its worst exemplar in history, and further recognizing the Essenic element in the new thought, Jewish apologetics does not meet the requirements when it points out that the barbarism of the ancient law of retaliation had been outgrown. If Jesus took any exception at all to it, he must have done so with regard to its contemporaneous interpretation. The truth is that he took no exception to it, any more than he objected to the laws of murder and adultery. He was probably content with the civilized view-point of Jewish practice in exacting a money damage for personal injury. It is merely another instance of rigorism and follows the usual formula. This formula was apparently strange to the heathen Christians who collated the logia which came to their hands. They show this when in order to stress a famous moral they put a false quotation into the mouth of Jesus, when he is made to say that the people were taught to love their friends and hate their enemies. Jesus certainly was better acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures than that. And certainly he did not think that in order to teach universal love he had to abrogate any of the fundamental practical legislation upon which the life of Israel was based. I have gone to some length in treating this peculiar factor in Christian history, for it makes it apparent that the time will come when not merely the scientific and liberal Christian scholar will recede from his present stand upon the personality and the teachings of Jesus, but all Christian theologians will have to admit that impartial science justifies the long and firm resistance of Judaism to its daughter religion.

Modern liberal writers no longer attempt in real earnest to establish the claim of Christianity on the basis of prophecy, miracle or Church tradition. What they do is to make an attempt to show that Judaism had outlived its usefulness at the time of Jesus and was falling into a rapid decay. That Christianity took up the religious task of Israel where it had been dropped and developed

it and spread it to the four corners of the earth. In order to reach this conclusion they show a continuous development within Israel up to the time of the second temple. From then on they show a continual degeneration. The night of legalism as they call it, set in. Religion became formal and external, spiritual values were entirely lost sight of, and the very virtues which religion is supposed to foster they show to have almost departed. The Pharisees in the N. T. are pictured as religious hypocrites who spent their time in arguing about the minutiae of religious ritual practice, who were filled with an enormous pride, and who spitefully revenged all opposition; Judaism from the time of the destruction of the Temple they picture as a fossilized remnant of the old forerunner of Christianity without purpose or justification on earth. Further they point out the natural limitations of ancient Judaism and by the same token of modern Judaism. They show it to have been a national religion, without thought or hope of any wider mission; they devote whole chapters to what they are pleased to call the defects of the O. T. religion. Before turning to the answers which Judaism has given to all these criticisms I should like to say that one of the early tasks of J. A. will be to write a critical history of Christianity, an account which will show the true factors in its rise and rapid growth and which will, therefore, allow all the ancient claims of Christianity for itself and against Judaism to fall of their own weight. Friedlander's *Geschichte der juedischen Apologetik* furnishes ample material for an excellent introduction. The sixth chapter of Eschelbacher's *Das Judentum und Das Wesen des Christentums* forms an excellent summary for the first few chapters of such a history. A careful reading of Haus-rath, Holtzmann, Harnack, Joel, Geiger and some others will supply much interesting material, in addition to that gathered from older writers, and of course, from the sources themselves.

In answer to the frequent charge made of the fixity of Judaism, Guedemann particularly devotes several chapters to show its fluidity. The first two chapters of his *Juedische Apologetik* are devoted to the subjects, "Judaism as Revelation and Judaism as Tradition." He shows therein the vital differences between Judaism and Christianity in that the people of Israel were considered

the instruments and the vehicles of both the revelation and of tradition. Without Israel there would have been no Torah, as one of the rabbis put it. This is important because it showed that the Jews did not feel that the Torah was imposed upon them from without and formed an intolerable burden or yoke as the favorite word is. They lived in it and it lived in them. Schechter has said that a Jew can not understand the use of the word yoke as Christian writers have it, as the Ol Torah or Ol Malkhuth Sham-mayim has always had a joyous connotation among the most strictly observing Jews. Again it refutes the letter worship charge which has so frequently been brought and which has been based on the Pauline sentence (2 Cor. 3:10). "For the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." It does not require any very wide acquaintance with ancient literature to know how cavalierly they used the letter of the Scripture. They made it to serve every progressive, spiritual and moral demand, and used the letter of the Scripture to form a foundation for their own religious progress. What Paul or whoever wrote the sentence was trying to oppose, we all know. The heathen Christians based their new mythology on allegorical interpretations of Scripture. The rabbis, in opposing them, naturally held to the true meaning of the text. This was the literalism which the N. T. writer could not tolerate. And, therefore, perhaps the best thing which could be added to the famous verse is that the life he was trying to support received no strength either from the letter or the spirit. As for Israel, it always read progress even in the story of the revelation. The various attributes of God were progressively revealed during the course of Israel's history. Their adherence to the Torah, as the record of the revelation saved them from all kinds of religious aberrations. The frequent impostures with which all religious history is filled, find little exemplification in that of Israel. For the Torah they were willing to sacrifice anything, for it was in reality their life, the very offspring of their own religious genius.

Judaism has always held the broad view, though perhaps the fact that there has appeared to be in the minds of many, even of some Jews, some basis to the charge of bibliolatry, will need some consideration. In this place all I can say is that it was a reflex movement.

due in large measure to the rise and the activity of early Christianity. Rabbi Akiba who perhaps more than any other man helped to establish it, was a contemporary of Paul. His reverence of the single word and letter of Scripture was prompted by what he must have considered the desecration of them by the Pauline party. But, as I have said, this was merely a by-product and by no means typical of the spirit of Judaism. That spirit was shown by the free criticisms which ruled in the formation of the canon, Sabbath, 30b, 13b, when the Proverbs of Solomon, the Book of Koheleth and even the prophet Ezekiel, were almost excluded.¹ Instead of blind worship then we can see that there was always more or less of what we to-day call criticism. Judaism always consulted its own religious consciousness as well as the revealed word. These two stood side by side as factors in the determination of the belief and practice of Judaism. And it is also owing to this spirit that we have to-day our sacred literature preserved as wonderfully as it has been against the onslaught of time and circumstance. Without changing a single word or letter our fathers allowed themselves the greatest latitude of interpretation and did not halt their religious progress because of some Biblical law or passage. Even before the canon was completed some parts of it were already obsolete. Judaism was and remained the most practical of all religions. As the maiden by the Red Sea was reputed to have had a concreter revelation than any of the prophets,² so always God was the God of history and was known by his works. *Lephi maasai ani niqra*. It was this view-point which ruled in all the older Jewish Apologetics and which made the claims of older Christianity, and for that matter, of modern orthodox Christianity ridiculous to the Jewish masses. Suppose even at the best that all the arti-

¹In reply to those gentlemen, who, in the course of the discussion at the Conference, said that the writer was in error in including the Book of Proverbs among the books whose canonicity was debated, and to whom he had no opportunity to reply, the passage of Bab. Sabbath 30b may be adduced. It is near the bottom of the page and begins: "W'aph Sepher Mishle biqueshu lignoz shehavu debharaw sotherin ze eth ze."

²Mechilta Ex. 15, 2.

³Harnack (Encyc. Brit. "Manichaeism") says that at the close of the third century Christianity was still "part and parcel probably of the Judaism which gave it birth." (This is note referred to on Page 284.)

ficial interpretations of the prophets are correct, we can fancy the older writers saying, history does not bear out your claims. Plain common-sense shows that the time of the Messiah has not yet arrived. We do not see that "they do no more evil, and not destroy on my entire holy mountain. That the earth is full of the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. 11:9). While Judaism held faithfully to the Scriptures the whole of life and history was also a part of God's revelation. Although I shall treat later of the Messianic expectation, it may be remarked here that because of this view-point of common-sense, Judaism has frequently been charged with having a materialistic conception of the Messianic era. People who are willing to suffer loss of all earthly possessions, to undergo torture and even death for a materialistic idea of the Messiah at least show the most idealistic attachment to it. The content of the Messianic conception, as I shall show later on, however, totally disproves the charge.

The idea of the continuity of the revelation in the life of the people is further exhibited in the authority of Jewish tradition. Here it is where Judaism feels the brunt of the attack of the non-Jew and even of the pretentiously impartial non-Jewish critic. Not only the liberal school of German theologians but practically every English writer of note almost consciously, as it would appear, misrepresents this factor of Judaism. When reading a book which is given into the hands of theological students as a guide and authority, the Jew must shudder at the dark picture which is portrayed for these innocents. No wonder they become incapable of taking a fair view of our religious history. Wellhausen is largely responsible for the modern form of it, as he has pretended to give it scientific basis. Bruce in his *Apologetics*, devotes four chapters to the consideration of this phase of our history. They are entitled "Judaism," "The Night of Legalism," (and a dark night indeed it is, when you read the gruesome account) "The Old Testament Literature" and "Defects of the Old Testament Religion." As an indication of the completeness of the description it may be noted that, excepting a single fleeting reference to Darmestetter in a

foot-note, not a single Jewish authority is cited. Of course it would be asking too much to require such a writer to quote the Jewish sources first hand. Outside of the general summaries which Bruce gets from the various introductions to the literature of the O. T., his four chapters are utterly worthless to any one who is looking for a fair presentation of these themes. In Bruce, as in nearly all modern non-Jewish writers, we find the same old misrepresentations of the Pharisees. For them Geiger has written in vain. Even a writer of so scientific a temper as Schuerer can not tear himself away from the N. T. caricature of them. The origin of this black picture is, of course, the false portrait of the Pharisees contained in the New Testament. And yet it is a notable fact that the only Pharisee who is mentioned by name in the N. T. totally negatives the general account given of that so-called sect.¹ Luke gives another instance of a Pharisee's religious view-point. The revised version of the passage is as follows:

"And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, 'Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?' And he said unto him, 'What is written in the law? How readest thou?' And he answering said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself.' And he said unto him, 'Thou hast answered right, this do, and thou shalt live.'"

The answer of the Pharisee was typical of the teachings of the day as stated by Hillel and his followers as the most superficial knowledge of the Talmud is sufficient to prove, but it seems likely that the editor of the Gospel must have purposely omitted the first part of the answer, the *Sh'ma*, which Jesus would probably have accepted quite as unreservedly. Eschelbacher points out that this passage must have worried the authors of Matthew and Mark a bit, as they put the answer into the mouth of Jesus himself. Though, therefore, traditional Christianity laid great stress upon the new doctrine enunciated by Jesus, the accounts themselves show that he had nothing new to add to rabbinical Judaism. Indeed our mod-

¹Acts 5:34.

ern theologians admit as much. Harnack¹ and Wellhausen² specifically declare that what Jesus taught was already to be found in the pentateuch and prophets, but that his task was to free it from the mass of encumbrances which had almost, yes entirely choked the life out of it. Further they claim, and in this, strange to say, some of our liberal Jews seem inclined to agree, that he widened their implication. He said explicitly what was only implicit before him. Guedemann's entire little book takes the bottom out of such a theory. He shows very plainly that Christianity added nothing at all to the depth of the spiritual content of Judaism, but indeed that it did materialize and lower the tone of much of it. Even the items which Harnack instances as distinctive of Jesus are but perversions of the traditional Jewish concepts by the generation which succeeded him. The Kingdom of God was not a new thought with Jesus. The term *Malkhuth Shammayim* was a common one in Jewish theology and liturgy. It remains even to-day in the Jewish prayer-book in a prayer originating, as Zunz held, from Rabh. This conception of the Kingdom of God was with Israel almost exclusively a spiritual one. Whatever external interpretation it had dealt largely with the attainment of the great ideals of religion in the world at large. But with the Pharisee there was no misunderstanding of the expression *Viqabblu kullom eth ol malkhuthekha*.

The Christian idea however of the Kingdom of God was something entirely different. "Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," as announced by the Baptist and as accepted and taught by the Nazarene, contemplated an early overturning of the world, the end of all things, and the second advent of Jesus even within the life time of some of his disciples. It was probably born of the excitement of the times and of the hope of the oppressed people for the day of a speedy redemption. But never-

¹Das Wesen des Christentums, p. 30 fol.

²See also Renan, *Histoire des origine du Christianisme*, the last volume. Preface V (quoted by Eschelbacher). Here Renan says that Christianity really began in the eighth century before the Christian era, at the time when the great prophets dominated the people of Israel and made of it a people with the task of bringing the pure worship of God into the world.

theless it was distinctly a coarsening of the beautiful spirituality of an idea which had always been characteristic of the traditional Jewish thought.

And precisely this very idea of the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus being the center of the new conception of the Kingdom of God is the one avoided by Harnack and the others in their attempts to extract the Wesen of Christianity. This is exactly its Wesen and nothing else. On this it spread and grew strong and on this it separated more and more from its spiritual mother Judaism. As I have said before, the very name of the daughter religion is enough to stamp its character. When the divinity and special Messiahship of Jesus is taken out of it, it has no longer a *raison d'être*. There is no need in this place to show that the Christian conception of the Messiah is not the traditionally Jewish one. No such occurrences as are narrated in the N. T. as indicative of its arrival were expected by the Jews. The advent of the Kingdom of God was for them to be marked by the appearance of peace and love on earth, the disappearance of warfare and hatred, and the universal recognition not only of the fatherhood of God, but also of the brotherhood of man, with Zion as the spiritual center, not alone of Israel but of the whole world.

So it was this and not any irresistible repugnance to rabbinism which formed the motive of Christianity. It is difficult to understand how the liberal theologians can get away from it. The orthodox have no inclination to avoid it. Though they, along with the liberals, also think it necessary to accept the dark picture of Pharisaism drawn by the N. T. writers and to embellish it by a quasi-historical substantiation. Their proofs somehow or other leave out the notable figures of Pharisaism and their notable teachings. It is as if the writer of American history were to draw his material for an account of a Democratic administration from Republican campaign speeches. Zunz, Geiger, and modern Jewish apologetes after them have shown that Jewish tradition, that is rabbinism, is the logical development of the religion of Israel. They have proven it to be the reasonable continuation and application of the truths of the Bible religion and ethics to the need of the times. Guedemann's chapter on Jewish tradition is masterly. He

proves conclusively that from a religious view-point the oral Torah, is and was always considered as important and as authoritative as the written Torah. Even when there is a divergence of rabbinical opinion the principle is *Elu w'elu dibhre elohim chayyim*. Quite contrary to being hide-bound the rabbis took into account all truth that they knew, for they taught that truth is the seal of God. Everything in harmony with the religion of Israel was *Torath Mosheh Mjssinai*. All Jewish history is looked at by the rabbis as a unit. They do not see the violent break which the ordinary historian, and some of them Jewish at that, point out between Biblical and rabbinical religion. The latter, as well as the earlier, was the natural religious expression of the people. Hausrath, in his *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*,¹ comes pretty close to proving this from isolated sentences of the N. T. itself, as against the avowed description there of a people bowed down with the burden of a legalism super-imposed upon them by punctilious rabbis. Others, like Schultz in his "*Grundriss der Christlichen Apologetik*," try to brush away the facts adduced from the rich rabbinical literature with the statement that they are romance. Hillel, for example, the latter says, can not be adduced as a type or example of the rabbinical period because he is transfigured in Jewish tradition. Which, indeed, we may readily admit, with the addition that the process of transfiguration has been much more complete with the personality of Jesus and with less good historical basis. Our friends the enemy seem to have a sort of hit and miss method. It is hit in the N. T. and miss in the Jewish sources. The hit is history and the miss is mystery. But the time is rapidly coming when there will be a greater appreciation and acceptance by non-Jews of the Jewish sources. It is indeed a pity that the discussions and decisions of the rabbis of the time of Jesus on the mooted question of the day, should have been so largely edited out of the Talmud. As Schechter thinks,² there must have been a great deal more of them, but the stress of the times, as well, perhaps as the desire to eliminate all mention of *Minuth* and *Minim* in schools, have almost completely removed all vestiges of those important his-

¹I, 9.

²Some aspects of Rabbinic Theology. Chap. I.

torical sources. Still these are not absolutely need to show that instead of a process of ossification or lignefaction, as our good friend Wellhausen describes it, rabbinism was the true and authoritative continuation of the older religion; and the teachers of the Talmud the authoritative successors of the prophets. They did not use the Torah as a spade with which to dig, but they devoted their lives to it out of their abundant love for it. The Pharisaic teachers earned their livelihood in trades and crafts, and it must be admitted that the Gospel writers rather adhere to good Pharisaic tradition in making Jesus a carpenter, as well as the son of a carpenter. Far from having the pride which the N. T. ascribed to them they are seen to be meek and lowly, engaging in the humblest work and receiving their authority from the people because of their learning and spirituality. They were placed by the people in the same category as Moses because they were all supposed to partake of the nature of his labor and of his authority.¹ So when we say with Bousset² that Scribalism, or rabbinism (*schriftgelehrtentum*) is Judaism, we do so from an entirely different point of view. Under rabbinism, as well as in the Bible, the Torah could be summed up in a single sentence, and without the Talmud, the Torah would scarcely have survived as it did. Rabbinism was not dry scholasticism, but the varied expression of a living faith and practice. It was the logical continuation of the Mosaic religion. Without it there would not be any knowledge or understanding of the ancient religion of Israel.³ Besides it kept the Torah always fresh and novel in the hearts of the Jews. The point is well expressed in a sentence of the Siphre. It is a commentary on Deut. 6:6, and reads as follows: "Shello yihyu b'enecha kediotagma yeshenah sheeyn adam muphne ella kechadasha shehakkol ratizm liqrathah." Much more could be said to show that the account given by Christian theologians of the Night of Legalism is entirely false, that the religion of the Talmud and the succeeding centuries was a live expression of a living faith,

¹Mishne Rosh Hash 2, 9.

²Volksfrommigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum (Berlin, 1903).

³Sukkah 20a "Keshenishtakhechah Torah miyyisrael alah Ezra Mibhabbel Veyassdah."

that the entire Jewish people was filled with zeal for the far ideals of its traditions, and that they were engaged in making as practical a demonstration of it as possible. There is an occasional recognition of the true value or at least a sympathetic consideration of this question in liberal Christian sources. Traverse Herford ("Christianity in Talmud and Midrash") admits that Judaism as well as Christianity has a right to exist and is proved by the witness of history during nineteen centuries to be capable of all the functions of living religion. If there were any doubt on this point one would only have to compare modern Reform and Orthodox Judaism, both of which base themselves on the traditions of Israel, and both of which meet the needs of Jews in these days, And this in spite of Bousset who doubts whether modern Judaism has remained essentially the same as that of the past. No Christian account of Judaism can claim the slightest authority which maintains the old view-point and which describes the religion of the rabbis as one of petty legal distinctions and which, as Guedemann says, "find the spirit of rabbinism (schriftgelehrtentum) expressed in the dispute between Hillel and Shammai over the egg which was laid on a holiday and loudly cackles over this find like the hen over the egg." Instead of tyrannizing over the Jewish people of the past it gave them religious independence, strengthened and purified their spirit and preserved them and the faith until this day. The spirit of the Talmud, if it is anything at all, is the spirit of research, combined with prophetic faith and idealism. And it was the spirit of independent research and was the school in which so wonderful a world's philosopher as Spinoza was trained. In the same way it made the entire Jewish people of the past a nation of thinkers, for the study of the Talmud, or more properly of Torah, was the national occupation and not restricted to a few professionals. Indeed it may be held that it was precisely this religious independence which made the origin of Christianity possible, which gave it both its adherents and its opponents. The first followers of Jesus, the Jewish Christians who were convinced of his mission and Messiahship, and who were later on condemned of heresy by the Church, justified their position in true rabbinical fashion. That much may be inferred from the discussions between

them and the rabbis which are still extant in the Talmud. The little sect was truly Jewish in spirit, and held strictly to the religion of the fathers. They knew the Torah and understood and felt its spiritual influence. Even Paul in talking to the Jews of Rome said, "We know that the law is spiritual." There is therefore an interpretation which may be put on the words of Clemens of Alexandria which fits very well with our reading of the character and the methods of rabbinical Judaism. I refer to his sentence that the "N. T. was written with the letters of the old." Of course it is also to be admitted that with the development of the new sect the spirit had entirely left the letters, as in the Midrash about Moses breaking the two tables.

One short word more and I shall proceed to the next matter of modern Jewish apologetics. This period of our religious history is frequently portrayed as one of dogmatism gone to seed. The scientific Christian theologians of the liberal school are forced to admit, however, that of the two religions Judaism is the freer of dogmatism. They, however, point to the future and its undogmatic Christianity. Now in the sense that they use the word dogmatic Judaism has always been without dogmas. But as we use the latter term its meaning is much enlarged and does not permit of an unmodified application of Judaism. When once the world will achieve a dogmaless Christianity—that is, Christianity with all of its specifically Christian dogmas omitted—it will witness at the same time a probably unconscious return to the religion of Israel. Huxley said that the religion of the prophets was the only one which appealed to him. This religion of the prophets was the same religion which the Jews of the Talmud and of the Middle Ages held and practiced, to-wit, in the Dark Night of Legalism. Thus our modern Christian apologetes have aimed to show that the daughter religion no longer rests its claims on the prophecies nor on the mythology regarding the founder of the faith. Their justification of the new religion rests as they claim upon the superior merits of Christianity. It was not necessary, they say, to add anything in morals or religion to the contribution of the Jewish law-givers and prophets, but it was necessary to free pure religion from

¹Romans VII, 14.

the network of ceremonialism and legalism with which the rabbis had surrounded it. With this we have dealt in somewhat inadequate fashion.

Another of the main postulates of modern Christian apologetics is that Judaism is a national religion, that it is forever limited to the Jewish people and can never become universal. Formerly it was very easy to answer this question because it was not complicated by any divergence of opinion in our own camp. But nowadays, strange to say, some of our own brethren may be heard making charges both against orthodoxy and against Zionism, which formerly were heard only in the camp of the enemy. We ought to be very clear on this subject and not allow our ideas of our religion and our history to become confused because of partisanship within the camp. We have no proper right to distinguish between the ideality of Judaism before or after the destruction of the nation. This much is indisputably certain, the history of Judaism shows beyond cavil that a religion may be in the strictest sense nationalistic and yet remain universalistic in the best sense of that term. And there is another thing to be borne in mind that Judaism has been and probably will remain for many years to come, the religion of the Jewish people. Whether we used the words nation and race or not, does not matter. Our critics are not concerned with ethnological problems. What they are pointing out is that Judaism has throughout its entire history been practically limited to the Jews. We do not have to blink the facts in order to make good our claim to possess a religion whose scope includes all mankind. We should in fairness accept all the facts of our history with their full implication and then prove the soundness of our theological position upon them. First, there is the designation of the chosen people. The election itself has been interpreted as a sign of narrowness and pride. But from the beginning of our records, we see that the election has been interpreted as being for the good of the entire human race. Abraham was told that through him all the families of the earth should be blessed. And it would be very easy to go through the Bible and our later literature and to show that throughout the whole course of Israel's history and thought this same conception has prevailed. But this has been

done by the authors with whom we are all familiar, and I shall take that much for granted. There is one consideration which, however, I have not often met in Jewish literature, and that is that the thought of the election and mission of Israel, is in its very nature a universalistic one. Otherwise it would have no meaning at all. If Israel was chosen at all, it was chosen for some purpose. And when that purpose is analyzed its universal scope is at once seen. The Bible and the Talmud are full of passages on the choice of the people of Israel and they all point to the one thing, the bringing of the knowledge of God and blessing to the four corners of the earth. The religion of the prophets has even been found fault with because it is not universal enough. This charge is, of course, false throughout, for the universalism of the prophets has not been equalled by any subsequent religious pronouncements. The specifications of the criticisms indicate that the horizon of the prophets was very limited. In their mention of the various nations of the earth which are to be brought to the knowledge of God and to the kingdom of peace, they mention only a few nations who lived in the proximity of Israel.

Granted that this may be true, which it is not, it would leave their universalism unquestioned. For if they include the nations with whom their hearers were acquainted and left out others of which they knew nothing, it is after all the spirit of universalism which takes in all the known world. What these gentlemen should have said is that the prophets were not very well taught in modern geography, and that we will readily grant. Our apogogetes have handled this question very satisfactorily. They show that the nationalism of Israel never was very narrow. Its treatment of the foreigner was of the most liberal character. Josephus quotes all of the laws which were made out of express consideration of the stranger, and all of our scholars have shown that the word stranger meant exactly what we take it to mean to-day. The Jews who have been pictured as being narrow alongside of the Greeks and Romans never had a word corresponding to "barbarian." Goy applied to Israel as well as to other nations. There is absolutely nothing offensive in it. The Bible teems with sayings showing the breadth of the ancient religion of Israel. The rabbis quoted some of these

sentences as being the very heart of Judaism. We are all acquainted with the dicta of Ben Azzai Hillel, Akiba and others which place the emphasis of Judaism precisely upon its universalism. Most writers admit the universalism of the prophets, but they say that its broad spirit was lost in Ezra and his successors. It will be enough to say in reply to this that the Talmud and the later literature overwhelmingly confute this criticism. Even the literature of modern times, from the tenth century and on, which Hamburger has compiled under the article *Christen* in one of his supplementary volumes completely negatives any such assumption. And it is also probably true that if Ezra and his successors had wanted to choke the liberality out of the religion of the prophets, to use Wellhausen's phrase, the prophetic books would not have been so well preserved for us by them.

Some writers, like Schill in his "*Lehrbuch der Apologetik*," simply admit the universalism of the well known passage in Genesis, and the many others in the Pentateuch and the prophets, and helplessly say that they are exceptional and stand forth prominently against the particularism of the Jews and other ancient peoples. What he would have said had he consulted the Talmud and found the passages wherein the various rabbis strive with each other to find the most comprehensive statements of universal religion may be left to the imagination. It is really too bad that the writers who have made up their minds about the backwardness of the "law" did not really take it into greater consideration for the determination of the point. They would then have learned that the laws about the most nationalistic celebration, namely the festivals, breathed a liberal spirit in their care for the stranger. And the stranger meant the foreigner, as may be seen from the reminder, "for ye know the heart of the stranger as ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

The prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple shows how greater solicitude was exhibited for the stranger "who is not of thy people Israel," than for the Israelites themselves. Guedemann examines the *Shmone esre* paragraph by paragraph and proves that it is in the largest measure universalistic and never

once marred by narrow nationalism. He proves that the Torah is throughout pervaded by the broadest humanitarianism. Quoting from Herman Cohn,³ he also refutes the claim that the word neighbor used in so many laws, referred only to the Israelite. And I refer to it because the translation of Leviticus 25:35 is not often correctly given in English. The usual translation reads as follows, and does not make very good sense: "If thy brother be waxen poor and his hand fail with thee; then shalt thou uphold him; as a stranger and sojourner he shall live with thee." The proper version would read: "If thy brother be waxen poor and his hand fail with thee, then shalt thou uphold him; be he a stranger or a sojourner, he shall live with thee." And here we have the *ger wet-shabh* named as a brother. Surely he is included in the word neighbor. Cornill says that the command not to abhor the Egyptian because Israel sojourned in his land is a true exemplification of the love of one's enemies. But rather than that it is an illustration of the high value placed by Judaism upon the virtue of hospitality, which is the exact opposite of narrowness and which characterizes every universalistic religion. The rabbis said that the duty of hospitality is greater than that of divine service.¹ Israel was taught to welcome the stranger, and it always has done so. It never claimed any special privileges or prerogatives. There is a whole series of Talmudic passages in which it is shown that the demands of universal religion are not made to the Israelites specifically but to all mankind. I refer to those in which it is shown that the words of Scripture are not made to refer to the priests, Levites, and Israelites, but to all men.² That Israel expected all men to keep the seven so-called laws of Noah is well known. In fact so important did they consider the spreading of this knowledge to all the people of the earth that many rabbis of mediæval and modern times give Christianity great praise for the share it had in promulgating these laws. (Cf. Hamburger *loc. cit.*).

Israel's isolation during the many centuries, whether it has been voluntary or not, is well justified by its own religious needs and by

¹Sabbath, 127 A.

²E. g. *Abhada Zara* 3-A; *Babha Qama* 38-A. Cf. also *Shoeher Tobh. Psalm I.*

³*Jahrbuch für jüdescher Geschihte und Literature* III. 87.

those of the world. This isolation called the attention of the world to the religious policy and ethics of Judaism; it also served as a warning to Israel not to imitate the ways of the Gentiles. There is nothing at all in this fact to be apologetic about. It was and is necessary that Israel continue to exist as a separate people. And those who think that it can not exist without continuing the dietary laws are not to be censured for their desire to maintain them. Surely it will at least be granted that they are within good Jewish traditions. There are also Christian edicts forbidding the pious to eat with Jews.

For the national character of Israel and for the national features of Israel's religion, then, no apology need be made. For in the earliest times, in the prayer of Solomon, in the rules of the Temple, in the laws of the stranger, in the liberality of the rabbis and their genuinely fraternal spirit toward all the world, in the remarkable proselytizing of the late pre-Christian centuries which indeed paved the way for Christian evangelization, in short in everything essential by which the religion of the Jews may fairly be judged, there is ample evidence of the broadest universalism. And in the analysis of modern Christian sects it is an open question whether nationalistic differences do not really underlie differences of creed and sect, as far as the main divisions are concerned.

IV. CONCLUSION.

I have already exceeded my given limit of time and space and have not yet touched upon several important issues in modern Jewish apologetics. These have to do largely with the relation of Judaism to the life of the Jews themselves, with their hopes for the future, both in this life and the next. The doctrine of the Messiah deserves a little more detailed treatment than I have given it. The truly modern form of that thought as it existed already at the end of the second century before the Christian era may be seen in the Book of Jubilees. There already the Messianic era is described as coming gradually by progressive spiritual development. (See Dr. Charles's article on the subject in the new Britannica.) This book also abandons the belief in bodily resurrection for that of spiritual immortality. However, since time will not permit of any further

discussion of these and a few other matters which could well be brought in, there is little use in even referring to them. For, after all, none of them will be new to the members of this conference. The third part of this essay was designed after all only to illustrate the method and manner of modern Jewish apologetics. It shows that the defense of Judaism is based both on our history and on our literature. It should be sufficient to show that Judaism, especially that of the second commonwealth, was by no means the caricature of the religion of the prophets which Christian historians and apologists have pictured it. As practically all of the Psalms originate from this period of our history, and since they are universally acknowledged to be genuine and beautiful expressions of true spiritual religion, they, as much as anything else, may be adduced to prove the incorrectness of many of the view-points of non-Jewish writers. In combating the attacks upon Judaism, Jewish apologetics naturally becomes polemical against Christianity. In doing so it brings into a strong light the true historical origins of Christianity. Friedlander's *Entstehungsgeschichte des Christentums* has ploughed fertile ground and his *Geschichte der Juedischen Apologetik* has also shown that the seeds of the new departure lay in Judaism. But besides showing the birthplace of the new sect, Jewish apologetics, particularly of recent years, has been demonstrating the hitherto neglected fact, that it was the grafting of heathen forms of thought, even more than the merely heathen forms of worship, upon the old stock, which gave it its first great impetus in the conquest of the ancient world. What is left for us to do is to give an account of the development of Christian mythology, which will include the results of our latest studies in comparative religion. I consider this important, for it will explain the ex-communication of the Ebionites, who were really the true followers of Jesus. It will explain the sudden sloughing of the entire Jewish form by the young religion. Eusebius gives the names of fifteen bishops who up to the time of Hadrian stood at the head of the community in Jerusalem and who adhered to circumcision. And in spite of this latter fact proving undeniably that the so-called liberal school of Christian theologians in their "back to Jesus" tendency are not on historical ground, there is the additional fact that it was, in

truth, Jewish active proselytism which really made way for Christianity. One has merely to read Schuerer to see this. But Graetz and other Jewish writers have also made particular studies on this subject and have brought forth good results. Direct evidence is brought from all of the ancient historians. Christianity has indeed to thank the Hellenistic Jews for the comparative ease with which it was able to spread its propaganda. And in doing so, it will have to give up its ancient fallacy that it alone is the logical and legitimate development of the religion of the Old Testament. For besides showing the real point of departure, Jewish apologetics have also forever laid the libel of the degeneration of the religion from the time of Ezra. We have proven incontrovertibly that our religion shows an unbroken development throughout its entire history, that each historical epoch shows a marked advance, in so far as the religion of the masses of the people themselves is concerned. I do not go so far as some when they say that we have had no Middle Ages. But using the term Middle Ages as it is generally applied to Christian history, there can be no denying this assertion. Instead of the isolation, spiritual and intellectual, which is so often spoken of, we see an invariable response of Judaism to all of the best tendencies of thought of all times and lands. We see further that Judaism is the only historical religion which has always readily responded to these. It is rather important, and will require some elaboration in the future to point out that as Judaism in ancient times was the intellectual and spiritual mother of Christianity, so also Jewish thinkers have also been the forerunners of modern Christian reconstructions. The reformation of Christian thought in modern times was in almost every instance prepared by Jewish thinkers. *Si Lyra non lyrasset Lutherus non saltasset.* As the mediæval Jewish scholars furnished the arsenal of the reformation, so did Spinoza reconstruct philosophy and start the progress toward modern theologies. Unconsciously Israel has therefore been fulfilling its educational mission even in fields where presumably it has been forbidden to enter. The Jews have been the teachers of Christians even in matters in which they have been wont to boast their peculiar virtue. Havet (*Le Christianisme et ses Origines*) says that the Jews taught the early Christians martyrdom for their faith. It has still to teach a part of the Christian world that true religion

does not require that non-believers should be made martyrs here or hereafter. It has also to teach that the best proselytization is conducted not by professional missionaries nor preachers but rather by the life of the whole Church. According to Jewish thought when God wished Israel to fulfill its mission in the world at large, he exiled the entire people from the Holy Land. *Lo higla Haqqadosh baruch hu eth yisrael lebhen haummoth ella kede sheyittosephu alehem gerim.*¹

And with this construction of Jewish history it is just as well to end this paper. For it sums up the developmental idea. It refutes the old charges of a retarded and fossilized faith, of a religion narrow and exclusively nationalistic, of an ethics inferior and materialistic, of a lack of vision for the glorious future, in short, of all of those beliefs, teachings and practices, which have always been part and parcel of Judaism, but which Christian writers seem to believe, the world had to do without until the advent of the daughter religion.

¹Pesachim 87-B.

K.

LEOPOLD STEIN.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE
OF AMERICAN RABBIS, JULY 5, 1911, AT
ST. PAUL, MINN.

By RABBI HARRY W. ETTELSON, Hartford, Conn.

The panoramic background of the Reform Movement,—its relations, within and without; its causes, predisposing as well as immediate; its progress from timid tinkerings to organic principles—all this, together with life-size portraits of most of the protagonists in the movement, has already been exhibited before this Conference and needs no further delineation from me, thanks to the notable series of centenary papers which have graced our program the last few years.¹

Mine indeed is a more limited, but still grateful commission. I am to paint in on one of the somewhat smaller panels in our gallery of fame, the features of a most benignant personality, whose large gifts of mind, heart and soul were altogether dedicated to the cause of progressive Judaism.

It has been said that many of the figures in the great frescoes which are the glory of Renaissance Art, were first executed by pupils; then came the master and with a few subtle touches gave to the face its light from within and to the whole form a breathing semblance. In this thought and expectation I set my work before you, hoping that, when I am through, eyes more clear to see, minds more skilled to mix colors, hands more deft to transfer to canvas, will correct my lines where disproportionate; tone down my tints, if too strong; and bring out in clear relief, what I may have obscured.

¹Vide the Holdheim, Samson Raphael Hirsch, Einhorn and Geiger papers in the Conference Year Books, Vols. 16, 18, 19, 20, respectively.

EARLY YEARS.

Leopold Stein was born Nov. 5th, 1810,² in the little Bavarian market town of Burgpreppach and into a home of simple, genuine Jewish piety. The seclusion of such an environment was congenial to the nurture of his deeply religious and poetic nature. His was a boyhood of dreams and the early sense of consecration to a high calling.³ He began his rabbinical studies under the tuition of a devout father, who, though a rabbi of the old type, sent his son to elementary school, even allowing him to receive private lessons in Latin from a friendly Catholic priest.⁴ How sweet these days were; what an atmosphere of affection and reverence he breathed under the paternal roof, is evidenced not only by two poems, written during his University term,⁵ but also by an elegy⁶ which appeared in his posthumously published *Morgenländische Bilder*.

YESHIBAH AND UNIVERSITY DAYS.

Shortly after his Bar mitzvah, Stein went to the well-known Yeshibah at Fürth. The authorities of this school, with Rabbi Wolf Hamburger at their head, were hopelessly medieval in their view-point and looked askance at all modern culture as well-nigh apostasy.⁷ To them, the edict of 1826, requiring courses in philosophy, history, literature and the sciences for rabbinical candidates, was simply another martyrdom for Israel.⁸

But the talented Stein had already tasted of the stolen waters of the Pierian Spring,⁹ and with mind all athirst for knowledge

²The Jewish Encyclopedia (article Leopold Stein) wrongly gives the date November 3rd.

³Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. 1, pp. 9, 10.

⁴Biographical preface to the *Morgenländische Bilder*, p. VIII, Frankfurt, A.M., 1885.

⁵Aufruf zur Freude and the opening stanzas of *Lehr-Naehr Wehrstand* in the *Stufengesaenge*, Würzburg, 1834.

⁶Dem Elternhause, *Morgenländische Bilder*, Frankfurt, A. M., 1885.

⁷Conference Year Book, Vol. 19, pp. 216-218. Kohler's paper on Einhorn.

⁸Monatschrift Liberales Judenthum, Nov., 1910, p. 1.

⁹He mentions especially the influence of Goethe's works. *Schrift des Lebens*, part I, p. 10.

more satisfying than Talmudic dialectics, he, with others formerly of the Yeshibah¹⁰, eagerly attended the gymnasium of Erlangen, and Bayreuth, and later the University of Wuerzburg.

What a passion for learning and consecration to Truth filled these enthusiastic youths? "Struggling with privations, for years denying ourselves many days in the week all warm food, we, a little group of congenial spirits, were fully cheered and sustained by the thought of our future calling; the fervor of a holy cause warmed and nourished us, so that, like Daniel and his friends, who would not partake of the royal board, we were sated and happy, even if our provision was scanty." So Stein writes in retrospect,¹¹ stating in the same paragraph that, "though he frequented the halls of world wisdom and gave himself to humanity, he always found his way back to God's House. How altogether gratuitous the apprehension that modern culture would spell doom to Judaism.

THE STUFENGESAENGE.

In 1834, the year of his graduation appeared Stein's first volume of poems, *Die Stufengesaenge*.¹² It is a slender little volume, not heralding indeed the song-burst of a new commanding voice in German Literature, yet none the less revealing a sweet and genuine singer. The sense of Spring fills and thrills the volume—Spring in the burgeoning and beauty of Nature: Spring in the expectancy and idealism of youth; Spring, above all, in the budding promise of the new era of humanity and brotherhood, which the poet passionately acclaims.

Especially interesting, from the Jewish standpoint, is the poem Stein builds up around the medieval legend of Amon and the Bishop of Mayence,—a poem, which despite too lengthy elaboration and some unconvincingness in the characterization of the Bishop,

¹⁰Conference Year Book, Vol. XIX, p. 217.

¹¹Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, p. 10, sec. 28, cf. Vol. II, p. 447, sec. 610.

¹²Stufengesaenge, Würzburg, 1834. He beautifully explains the title in an introductory lyric to the effect that life, the individual's life, Israel's life, Humanity's life, is an ascent up through the valley of weeping to the mount of the spirit and hence the poet's songs should שירי מעלות *Stufengesaenge*—Songs of Accent.

is a work of not a little imaginative power. It is herein that we find the fine, free-flowing, metrical version of the וּנְתַנָּה תּוֹקֶה. This, together with the eight poems in the appendix—(translations some from the liturgy, some from the Spanish-Hebrew poets)—are Stein's first promising ventures in a field, in which later he was to make some of his most distinctive contributions.

Even at the risk of dwelling disproportionately on the Stufengesange, I can not dismiss them, without speaking of their deep spiritual tone. It is not so much that their subject matter is specifically religious, as that God seems to be a real and abiding presence in the mind and heart of their author, so that the sense of the divine spontaneously utters itself. Here surely was one consecrated from birth to religion. We feel that it was no mere piece of rhetoric on his part when, many, many years later, on leaving the active ministry, he said "I step out of my office, but not out of my vocation."¹³ He was the preacher inevitably!

HIS ACTIVITIES AT BURGKUNDSTADT.

The year Stein came forth as author also brought him the call to his first position as rabbi of Burgkundstadt. The nine years he spent here were almost idyllic in their serenity and harmony. The circumstances of the place made possible a sweet intimacy between rabbi and congregation.¹⁴ Already then, even in the enthusiasms and impulsive ideals of gifted youth, Stein revealed the middle ground attitude, which was later to be his characteristic standpoint. "He was not going to imitate," said he, "Phaeton's mad career through the heavens in a sun-chariot, which scorched some places and left others cold, instead of diffusing light and warmth everywhere." Nay, his work would be gradual—"descending gently as the rain and distilling as the dew."¹⁵ And so, almost with no opposition, he was able to bring about his reforms in the congregation and introduce many changes in the liturgy.

¹³Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, p. 15, sec. 39. "Ich scheide aus meinem Amte, nicht aus meinem Berufe."

¹⁴Frankfurter Zeitung, Nov. 5, 1910.

¹⁵Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, pp. 11, 12.

THE GEBENE AND GESAENGE AND THE SEDER HAGGADA.

His Gebene and Gesaenge¹⁶ and the original edition of his Seder Haggada¹⁷ date from this period. The former volume, (Hebrew title חבית הזוק) contains prayers and poems in German, for use on New Year and the Day of Atonement. Though Stein insisted all along on Hebrew being retained in the service as a bond of union for the members of Israel's household,¹⁸ at the same time he early recognized and met the need for prayers in the vernacular. These prayers were both translated and original—the latter at times too diffuse, but always of simple, sincere, devotional spirit.

However, much more important in this booklet than the Gebene are the Gesaenge. Among several other fine ones is the well-known "Tag des Herren," which triple stropic choral Stein composed to the traditional Kol Nidre melody. Excellent above all is the taste and skill with which he has selected and rendered some Piutim, giving to the obscure, intricate, oft bizarre versification of these "arabesques and grotesques" a clear meaning and attractive rhythm, while preserving some of the allusiveness and terseness of the original.

Comparing these with the corresponding ones in Sachs' Machzor, the palm, in my opinion is easily Stein's. However, in all fairness it should be added that the irregular, rhymed prose of Sachs' translation reproduces more faithfully and finely Gabirol's כסר מלכות than does the translation thereof in verse which Stein published as a separate work in 1838.¹⁹

The Seder Haggada, later incorporated in Stein's prayer book, was one of the first efforts to reclaim for the Jewish home that quaint, inspiring service by adapting its essentials to a modern form. Here again Stein's poetical talents were put to excellent use in introducing rollicky table-songs, versifications of some of the

¹⁶Erlangen, 1840.

¹⁷Erlangen, 1841.

¹⁸Introduction to Stein's Prayer Book סדר העבודה Frankfurt a. M. 1860; also Philipson's The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 243.

¹⁹In the Allgem. Zeit. des Judenthums (yr. 1838 p. 166), Leopold Dukes however reviews Stein's edition of the כסר מלכות very favorably.

old material and other appropriate features. Especially spirited in its lilt is the Schluss-gesang to the tune of the **אָדיר הויא** Stein's rendition of the **זיך נדיא** is also a happy one, for though he suggests the allegorical interpretation by introducing the refrain, "Ein grosser Gott regieret, Der alles wohl durchfuehret," yet he somehow cleverly manages to retain the nursery rhyme and jingle effect. Unique about the book is the fact that Stein emphasizing the family character of the feast, does not assign all the **מה נשתנה** to the paterfamilias and the youngest boy, but designates some parts for the Hausfrau as well.

OTHER ACTIVITIES.

Amid these activities and the other demands of his rabbinical office, Stein still found time to contribute many poems to the *Musen-Almanach* of Friedrich Rueckert, under whose influence he had already come at the gymnasium of Erlangen, and with whom, now that they were close neighbors, he formed an intimate friendship.²⁰ Stein also wrote various articles for the different Jewish periodicals, interesting himself in the stirring issues of the day and becoming known in large circles as one of the progressive spirits.

THE CONDITIONS AT FRANKFORT.

In March, 1844, he was unanimously called to Frankfort on the Main, as associate-rabbi, his election being ratified without much ado by the Senate, though the Senior Rabbi, Abraham Solomon Trier attempted some of the machinations of Tiktin.²¹ The staunchly orthodox Rothschild family, to show their disapproval, withdrew their gift of 250,000 florins for a contemplated communal institution, which action called forth the clever witticism that the rabbi-elect was indeed "ein sehr theurer Stein!"²²

It was a complex, critical situation in which the new-comer found himself,— a situation challenging all his courage and tact and

²⁰Stein later paid tribute to this friendship in his *Friedrich Rueckert's Leben und Dichten*. Bei Sauerlander, 1866.

²¹Philipsón's *Reform Movement in Judaism*, p. 193. *Der Orient*, year 1844, p. 12.

²²*Der Orient*, year 1844, p. 165.

cheer. The historic congregation of Frankfort²³ which had participated in so many of the stirring checkered experiences of the Jew through the centuries, was naturally one of the storm centres in the new movement. The very year before the date of which we are writing the so-called Society of the Friends of Reform²⁴ had sent forth their fuming manifestoes, and the clouds still rumbled with the reverberations of the circumcision controversy, and flashed, if not with forked, at least with heat lightning, against the "fort-kriechende Rabbinismus."²⁵ Then too, there was the muttering of the strongly Orthodox element, which latter broke forth with the thunderclap of separation from the synagogue, brilliantly surcharged by the magnetism of Samson Raphael Hirsch's personality.²⁶

STEIN'S PRINCIPLE OF THE VIA MEDIA.

Under such threatening heavens and from the comparative calm of Burgkundstadt, Stein came to Frankfort. It was his avowed purpose to be conciliator and unifier, the mean between the extremes.²⁷ This with him, let it be said emphatically, was not policy, but principle. Opportunism, mere temporizing and compromising, the easy-going desire to please, were altogether alien to his nature. Did not he later, when already past middle age²⁸ resign the position and with it the assurance of a pension for himself and an annuity for his family, rather than agree to certain conditions set by his Board of Trustees, which seemed to him a limiting of the Rabbi's freedom; this too, notwithstanding that Geiger tried to persuade him that the conditions were negligible and could be accepted?²⁹ No, there was nothing of the time-server or vacillator about Stein.

²³Philipson's *Old European Jewries*, pp. 46-81

²⁴Stein was among those who had most incisively arraigned the Verein. *Litteraturblatt des Orients*, 1843, Nos. 46-48.

²⁵For a clear account of the whole controversy see Philipson's *Reform Movement in Judaism*, Ch. 6.

²⁶Vide Heller's paper, Samson Raphael Hirsch, *Conference Year Book*, Vol. 18, p. 197.

²⁷*Schrift des Leben's*, Vol. I. p. 13, 14, sec. 36, 37.

²⁸*Mein Dienst-Verhältniss zum Israelitischen Gemeinde-Vorstande zu Frankfort A. M.*, 1861, p. 57.

²⁹Dr. Geiger and his Departure from Breslau to Frankfort, 1862. Also Schreiber's, "The Pioneers of the Reform Movement," chapter on Geiger.

But, as hinted above³⁰ all Stein's gifts, mental and temperamental, made naturally for the *via media*. His was a disposition of sweetness and light,³¹ hence, though having the full courage of his convictions, he was almost instinctively disinclined to militancy. His was a sympathetic imagination, quick to see, and a fair mindedness ready to acknowledge the good in either side, hence blind partizanship and the zeal of factions could not sweep him into their currents³²; his was the spiritual warmth of the preacher-poet and the intellectual striving of an eager, open modern mind, hence the iconoclastic logic of radicalism, disregarding pious memories and the impotent sentimentality of romanticism, out of touch with the real, equally repelled him as partial view-points³³; his, finally, was a passion for historic unity and for the solidarity of the congregation in Israel, hence he worked with the "all" in view, and was reluctant of everything that threatened schism.³⁴

HIS INAUGURAL SERMONS.

These feelings and attitudes, permeating all his writings and expressed in various forms are found practically in their entirety in the first two sermons he delivered on assuming charge at Frankfort.³⁵ No outline, only actual reading can convey the fine spirit of

³⁰In connection with his Burgkundstadt ministry.

³¹Read his inaugural sermon at Frankfort in his volume *Koheleth Frankfort A. M.*, 1846.

³²*Schrift des Lebens*, Vol. I, p. 31, sec. 69, 70.

³³*Koheleth*, Introd. XVI. "Around two poles the axis of my activity turns; Striving after Progress; Love for the inherited Faith." See especially *Koheleth*, pp. 42-46.

³⁴So much so that he quotes three or four times approvingly the passage in the *Yalkut* to Hosea 4:17 to wit:—"Great is the worth of peace, so great that even if Israel is worshipping idols, as long as there is unity and peace in his midst, God says, (so to speak), I can not touch him to punish him." Vide *Schrift des Lebens*, Vol. II, p. 274; p. 415; also *Koheleth*, p. 35. Stein seems to have had much difficulty to reconcile himself to the withdrawal of the orthodox from the congregation. C. f. *Mein Dienst-Verhaeltniss*, pp. 18-20.

³⁵*Koheleth*, Frankfort, A. M., 1846. 1st and 2nd sermon.

both, mild yet vibrant with fearlessness; their harmonization of the new and the old, of the claims both of faith and reason, of Jewish individuality and world-citizenship; their chaste simplicity of diction, their skillful utilization of text, with intertwinings of felicitous passages from the Midrash—in a word, their entire appropriateness.

Their reception at the time they were delivered was most enthusiastic. "It represents," to quote only one of many complimentary notices, "a wonderful achievement even for Stein, with his well-known eloquence, to be able to speak under such critical circumstances for two hours and not only not to arouse antagonism, but to tone down animosities and stir up the indifferent."³⁶

Favorable, however, as were these first impressions, the inherent differences between the parties were too great, the feelings too strong not to rise to the surface again as soon as it came to carrying out the program practically. The group of radical laymen, whose animus against theologians had already expressed itself in the very constitution of the Society of the Friends of Reform³⁷ soon raised the cry (a cry continued throughout Stein's ministry) of priestcraft, hierarchical tendencies, ecclesiastical usurpations, cowardly compromise.³⁸ The orthodox equally opposed Stein's efforts as vandalizing and schismatic and their opposition to his measures of reform, moderate as they were, led finally to their forming a congregation of their own.³⁹

Looking back from the vantage point of nearly a score of years later, Stein writes that he sees now that it could not have been otherwise; that the time was not a time for conciliation, that the issues had to be fought out, before peace proposals could be even considered. Meanwhile, standing between the two camps, he was struck by volleys from both sides. And he sadly quotes the Biblical

³⁶Der Orient, 1844, pp. 181-183; Allgemeine Zeitung, 1844, under date of May 24th.

³⁷Philipson's, "The Reform Movement in Judaism," p. 161 ff.

³⁸Der Orient, 1845, p. 386; 1846, p. 215 ff.; Allgemeine Zeitung, 1855, p. 78; Introduction to Stein's Koheleth, p. XIV.

³⁹Allgemeine Zeitung, 1850, p. 483; Stein's Mein Dienst-Verhältniss, pp. 18-19.

Writer: "These are the wounds which I have received in the House of those who should have loved me."⁴⁰

HIS CONFERENCE ATTITUDES AND UTTERANCES.

Notwithstanding these oppositions and enmities, Stein eagerly carried on his work during the eighteen years of his connection with the congregation.⁴¹ He was a prominent figure in both the Frankfort and Breslau Conferences, being president of the one, and vice-president of the other, and actively participated in the memorable debates of those historic gatherings.⁴²

On the liturgy question he favored, as did the majority, the emphasis of Israel's universalistic hopes, and the omission, accordingly of all references to the priestly cult and national restoration.⁴³ At the same time, he did not want to leave out the mention of the personal Messiah, saying, in effect, (a la Carlyle's Hero and Hero-Worship), that all great events and movements are ushered in by great personalities, and may we not therefore confidently expect that the glorious era of religious harmony, peace, and brotherhood will be accomplished through one sent of God?⁴⁴ This view, variously stated, finds expression, both in the introduc-

⁴⁰Die Schrift des Leben's, Vol. I, pp. 13-15.

⁴¹Der Orient, 1845, p. 389, speaks of Stein's wide communal activities and interest in all humanitarian causes; p. 369 speaks of his introducing Saturday afternoon services for working men with great success. Jewish Chronicle, 1882, p. 6, pays tribute to his liberal political views and speaks of his eloquent speeches during the stirring times of 1848.

⁴²Der Orient, 1846, p. 231 speaks of Stein's taking stand against noticing communication of the Berlin Reform Association, opposing in this Geiger, Holdheim and Hess. Under date of August 22nd, 1846, (vide Der Orient, 1846, p. 282) Stein issued Erklärung defending the Conference vigorously.

⁴³Stein's attitude in this regard is best expressed in the following words: And now that we again have a Fatherland,—ah, long denied good fortune—we gladly sacrifice thereto the old yearning for the Land of our Past; not a "Return," but a "forward movement" constitutes our Salvation. Our holy ark, as formerly in the Temple itself, stands at the West. (Die Schrift des Lebens Vol. I. p. 8, sec. 23; c. f. ibid. pp. 302-303, secs. 236-239; also Vol. II page 468, articles 23-26.)

⁴⁴Der Orient, 1845, p. 268; Philipson's The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 253.

tion to his Prayer Book and in different sermons, as late as 1869;⁴⁵ But toward the last he expressly repudiated it, stating that whereas Christianity is a Saviour-system, Judaism is a God-system and Israel is the Messiah-people, the Servant of the Lord spoken of by Isaiah.⁴⁶

In this connection it is interesting to note that though Stein did not believe in a return to Palestine,⁴⁷ yet he insisted on retaining the prayers for the glorification of Zion, and his imagination was fascinated (it is a trick of poetic fancy) by the thought of Jerusalem as the religious capital of the world. "Along with the Messianic ideal we have," he said, "given place in our prayer-book to the great promise that humanity will one day bring to view its sense of unity in God through a great Temple of the Peoples. This will find its eternal site in Jerusalem, where else? Certainly not in Berlin, the metropolis of Protestantism; nor in Rome, the center once of the Pagan, now of the Catholic world; but at Jerusalem, the Holy City, in which all peoples and religions have a vital participation."⁴⁸

On the Sabbath question Stein took decided issue with Holdheim's Sunday proposal, passionately declaring: "You bury Judaism on Friday evening to have it resurrected on Sunday as another religion."⁴⁹ For Stein the Sabbath is primary.⁵⁰ It is the sign of the covenant of the spirit as contrasted with circumcision, the sign of the covenant in the flesh. To bring about its consecrated observance, not according to the letter but to the spirit of the law, is the supreme duty of the present. And he praises warmly the orthodox for the sacrifices they are making to preserve the day, and appeals to the reformers to do likewise from their point of view.⁵¹

⁴⁵Aus dem Westen, pp. 57-58, Mannheim, 1875.

⁴⁶Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, pp. 320 and 336.

⁴⁷Introd. to Stein Prayer Book, p. 2, 1860 edit.; also Zur Neuen Liturgie, Statement of Principles.

⁴⁸Preface to Stein's Prayer Book, 1882 edit. Also, Aus dem Westen, p. 57. Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. II, p. 451.

⁴⁹Protokolle der dritten Versammlung, p. 167.

⁵⁰Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. II, pp. 452, 453.

⁵¹Ibid. p. 466, articles XVI-XVIII, particularly article XVII.

HIS PERIODICALS.

The decade 1850-1860 were years of crowded work. During this time Stein edited the ten volumes of *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer*—a popular monthly in which appeared sermons, liturgical and other poems, reviews, theological discussions and articles on the various issues of the day, by himself and others.⁵² His principal activity, however, was in connection with his Prayer Book and the building of the New Temple.

THE PRAYER BOOK.

Space is lacking for any real review of the Prayer Book, much less any comparison between its first and second editions.⁵³ Its guiding principles were in the main those laid down at the Frankfort Conference. But certain practical considerations, and toward the end, the further fact that the book had to be hurried in order to be out in time for the Temple dedication⁵⁴ necessitated some changes and made contradictions and inconsistencies inevitable.⁵⁵

Much, both in general statement and in details which Dr. Philipson writes so excellently about Geiger's Prayer Book,⁵⁶ applies to Stein's. There is, however, apart from some additional minor points,⁵⁷ this great difference between them:—whereas in Geiger's,

⁵²Stein also edited a Family Weekly, *Der Freitagsabend*, Frankfurt, 1860.

⁵³Hebrew title סדר העבודה 1st edition 1860; 2nd edition 1882.

⁵⁴Stein's *Mein Dienst-Verhältniss*, Frankfurt A. M., 1861, pp. 43-44. See particularly *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer*, Vol. 5, 178 ff.

⁵⁵Thus, although in his preface he states that prayers reflecting the priestly cult and national restoration will be omitted, nevertheless in the *ברכת המזון* he retains the formula *ובנה ירושלים* again, he has *וזכרון משיח בן דוד עבדיך* also *הרחמן הוא יקום לנו סכת דוד הנפלת* cf. the seven benedictions of his form of wedding ceremony. In the *מוסף של שבת ראש חדש* there is mention of the old sacrifices and offerings. These few examples must suffice. The second edition of the Prayer Book (1882) has many changes and corrects most of these inconsistencies, but a few persist, nevertheless.

⁵⁶Conference Year Book, Vol. XX. pp. 269-273.

⁵⁷One of the peculiarities of Stein's Prayer Book (1st edition) is the fact that alongside of a revised form of certain traditional prayers in Hebrew, the older form is also printed in smaller type for the satisfaction of the more conservatively inclined.

the German element is very small, in Stein's, the prayers are translated throughout and original prayers and special services for the festivals are introduced, together with poetic paraphrases of the Psalms and versification of other parts of the liturgy. The whole last half of the volume is a "golden treasury" of religious poetry,—lyrics, chorals, hymns, meditations—most of them the outpourings, simple and spontaneous, of a rich spiritual nature and a fertile mind, and are expressive of nearly every mood of the devout heart and aspiring soul.⁵⁸

THE NEW TEMPLE.

March 1860 saw the final consummation of Stein's fondest desire. Almost from the beginning of his Frankfort ministry, he had pleaded for a new synagogue, urging that with the enthusiasm generated in such a communal work and in the environment of a new House of God, it would be easier to carry out harmoniously the desired reforms.⁵⁹ At last his arguments and appeals bore fruit and the splendid Temple became a reality.⁶⁰

But alas, the day which Stein had anticipated as his day of holiest joy, became one of intense bitterness and disappointment.⁶¹ In his dedication sermon on "memories and hopes" he touched on Israel's past sufferings, referring also to some of the sad associations of even Frankfort itself for the Jew.⁶² Members of the Senate and other high-German officials being present, the apologetic oversensitiveness of the Jew for the Goy expressed itself in the congregation's damning their rabbi as almost guilty of the unpardonable sin.⁶³

⁵⁸Stein often takes the central thought of the traditional prayers and with that as a keynote composes a special religious lyric. The *Allg. Zeit.* p. 624 Vol. 46 gives a very complimentary review of Stein's Prayer Book, praising especially its beauty and simplicity of German diction as well as its true warmth and inwardness.

⁵⁹*Mein Dienst-Verhältniss zum Israelitischen Gemeinde-Vorstande zu Frankfurt a. M. (Frankfurt A. M., 1861), p. 11.*

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁶²*Der Israelitische Volkslehrer*, Vol. X., pp. 124-129; also pp. 156-157.

⁶³*Allg. Zeit.* year 1860, p. 548. Stein's *Mein Dienst-Verhältniss*, pp. 48-49.

Reading the sermon over dispassionately, I personally find it somewhat difficult to understand why it should have been so unsparingly condemned, for the darker past was delineated only as a contrast to the bright and hopeful present. But of course, cold print does not allow us to gauge the intangible elements of crowd psychology which at the moment determined the impression of the spoken word. At any rate, justified or not, the general judgment was against the sermon, and Stein sadly tells us that even his best friends seemed to avert their gaze.⁶⁴

THE ISSUES BETWEEN STEIN AND HIS BOARD.

It is sometimes wrongly stated⁶⁵ that this hapless affair was the cause of Stein's disagreement with his board of trustees, which led to his resignation two years later. The fact is that the trouble was of long standing. Perhaps, if the sermon had been a signal, popular triumph it might have reacted favorably on the other mooted points. As it was however, it simply became an additional irritant in an already strained situation.

The real issues are clear enough. But in all controversy the determining factors are often, not so much the original issues involved, as the personal animus, the petty incidentals, the accidental variations, so to speak, which, though by-products, become as in biology, the origin of new species.

We can not enter upon the matter except in the most general way.⁶⁶ The predisposing cause was in the antagonism, latent and open, between the two extreme parties. The exciting cause was the "Articles of Instruction" imposed upon the associate rabbi,⁶⁷ which articles making due allowance for their original purpose were con-

⁶⁴Mein Dienst-Verhältniss, p. 49.

⁶⁵Even in the excellent little article on Stein by Dr. K. Kohler, (American Israelite, Nov. 3, 1911) there is this misapprehension.

⁶⁶Stein sets forth his side of the story (and it is indeed a sad narrative of inward and outward struggle) in a special brochure entitled "Mein Dienst-Verhältniss zum Israelitischen Gemeinde-Vorstande zu Frankfurt A. M." (Frankfurt A. M., 1861). The other side is reflected in a succession of articles written with considerable animus by Raphael Kirchheim (Allg. Zeit. Vol. 20, p. 258 ff. and p. 367 ff.; Vol. 22, p. 78 ff.)

⁶⁷Mein Dienst-Verhältniss Appendices A. & B., pp. 60-63.

stituted to tie the rabbi, hand and foot, and deliver him into the power of the Board, if the Board should be disposed to enforce the conditions to the letter.

Stein from the very start disapproved of the instructions, and accepted them only in the expectation that in practice they would work out differently, and that mutual affection and trust would break down all barriers. Besides, he thought they would apply, at the worst, only as long as he was associate-rabbi.⁶⁸ Again and again thereafter he sought for a different arrangement, each time being put off with promises. At length the issues concentrated in two demands by Stein.

First he demanded some official recognition in the affairs of the Philanthropin School.⁶⁹ As spiritual guide of the congregation he justly contended that he should be given some opportunity to come in living contact with the youth who were to be the future congregation, especially since the Philanthropin was the Congregational School and undertook not simply the secular but the religious instruction of the boys and girls even conducting regular confirmation services.⁷⁰ However, the controlling factors on the Board of the Philanthropin were, as it happened, the erstwhile members of the Society of the Friends of Reform and their influence nullified Stein's efforts in this direction.⁷¹ It was I believe in great measure here, as in similar instances to-day, a case of ambitious, able laymen using a charitable, educational, or fraternal organization as a medium whereby to contest communal leadership with the rabbi.

The second of Stein's demands was that, when purely religious matters were before the Board for decision, he should have the privilege of being present. After overtures and interchanges protracted over many months this point was finally conceded to Stein. But imagine Stein's chagrin, when at his first meeting of this character, having presented certain important matters before the Board, he

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 5.

⁶⁹See Philipson's, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, pp. 149-153; also *Jewish Encyclopedia* under title of Philanthropin School, for an account of this institution.

⁷⁰Stein's *Mein Dienst-Verhältniss*, pp. 30-31. *Allg. Zeit.* Vol. 20, p. 258 ff.; Vol. 22, p. 78 ff.

⁷¹*Mein Dienst-Verhältniss*, p. 35 ff.

was excused with formal thanks;⁷² being told that the Board would reserve its discussion and decision for executive session. This procedure rendered all that Stein had been contending for practically null and void. The issue, then⁷³ culminated in an ultimatum, and Stein being unwilling to take shadow for substance, sent in his resignation.⁷⁴

That, in its general principles, Stein's position was right⁷⁵ can not, it seems to me, be gainsaid, and it is somewhat strange, therefore, that Geiger should have urged Stein to yield and on Stein's positive refusal, himself have accepted the call. The affair became a cause celebre. Far be it from me, however, to take up the innuendoes of the anonymous pamphlets which it called forth.⁷⁶ The whole circumstance was unfortunate and the less said of it the better. Stein himself, writing later,⁷⁷ says he thanks God that he cherishes no bitterness in his heart either against those who rendered his position so difficult at the first, or prevented his reinstatement later.⁷⁸

HIS LATER ACTIVITIES.

The remaining years until Stein's death, December 2, 1882, were years of semi-retirement.⁷⁹ For some time he served as rabbi of the Emanuel West End Union, made up mainly of American families, among whom his work was most congenial.⁸⁰ He had a great admiration for America and things American, hailing America as

⁷²Ibid., pp. 51, 52.

⁷³Ibid., 56, 57.

⁷⁴Allg. Zeit. Vol. 26, p. 406 ff.

⁷⁵Allg. Zeit. Vol. 25, p. 657. Philippson has a splendid editorial on the issues involved, under the title Rabbi and Congregation.

⁷⁶Dr. Geiger's departure from Breslau to Frankfurt, Breslau, 1862.

⁷⁷Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, p. 15, sec. 40.

⁷⁸Allg. Zeit. year 1863, p. 169 tells of the petition signed by 260 heads of families requesting Stein's re-instatement, which petition was rejected by the Board of Trustees; also that these families contemplated forming a congregation of their own with Stein at the head.

⁷⁹Stein took no part in the great Synods of 1869-71. For a while he was at the head of a Young Ladies' Seminary, which he founded. (Allg. Zeit. Vol. 26, p. 657).

⁸⁰Introd. p. 1, Aus dem Westen (Mannheim, 1875).

the promised land for democracy and religion, and in this spirit⁸¹ contrasts, in splendid verse, its vigorous freedom with the enfeebled powers and tradition-ridden spirit of outworn Europe.

HIS LITERARY PRODUCTIONS.

Most of his time was given to indefatigable literary activities and a succession of notable works, prose and poetry, came from his fluent pen. Only a few can be touched upon in passing, the rest being indicated in the notes.⁸² His volume, "Morgenländische Bilder in Abendländischem Rahmen," utilizes the treasures of the Aggada and in flowing narrative verse, with no attempt at over-elaboration, brings out very attractively in most cases the elusive suggestiveness and ethical richness of the original.⁸³ Especially good is his rapid, few-line sketch of the Halacha and Aggada, in the Rabbi Akiba cycle of this volume.

THE DRAMAS.

Stein's plays show considerable mastery of blank verse and dramatic technic. Two of these deserve particular mention.⁸⁴ The first is "Die Hasmonäer," which in its fine action and characterization, in the sweep of its elevated diction and in its expression of impassioned religious patriotism, stands out, despite certain elements with which exacting critics may find fault, as a noble, loving tribute by a gifted son of Israel, to one of the most glorious chapters of Israel's glorious history.

⁸¹Haus Ehrlich, Leipzig, 1863, 2nd act, last scene; Allg. Zeit, 1903, pp. 428-438.

⁸²Friedrich Rückert's Leben und Dichten (1866); Orient and Occident (1866); Rede beim Fichtejubiläum, 1862; Der Kampf des Lebens, 1870; Aus dem Westen (1875); Die Hasmonäer (1859); Der Knabenraub von Carpentras (1862); Haus Ehrlich (1863); Des Dichter's Weihe, (1864); Das Parlament des Volksgetränke, 1862; Sinai, 1868; Die Schrift des Lebens, Vols. I & II. (1872-1873), Vol. (III) 1910. Morgenländische Bilder in Abendländischem Rahmen, 1885.

⁸³Allg. Zeit. yr. 1885, p. 271 has a very favorable review of this volume.

⁸⁴Both Die Hasmonäer and Haus Ehrlich were successfully played at Mannheim.

The other play I have in mind is "Haus Ehrlich," also a poetic drama, in which Stein sets himself to represent the interplay of tendencies and personalities, in their light and shadow, at the dawn of the new era of enlightenment in a typical Jewish community.⁸⁵ It is to be regretted that time and space are lacking to discuss this very interesting and more than creditable drama for, incarnated in living men and women, it makes most vivid and real the ideals, the strivings, the enthusiasms, the gropings, the half-truths, the traditions, the ceremonials, the passions and the antagonisms of the transition period.

DIE SCHRIFT DES LEBENS.

I come now to what can be only an all too brief characterization of Stein's most important work in prose, "Die Schrift des Lebens," the product of the matured thinking and leisure of his later years. To its composition he gave himself as to a consecration. It was his way of fulfilling his divine call, when he could no longer follow his rabbinical calling. His hope and desire was to awaken in the mind and heart of the Jew, amid the passing of traditions and a growing indifference a knowledge of and love for Judaism, by presenting in popular form the content and spirit of our historic religion, as expressed in "Doctrine, Ceremonial, and Ethics."⁸⁶

His method in the first part is not that of systematic theology, with its categories and dialects—nay, but a flesh and blood presentation, so to speak, of the great fundamentals of the faith relating to God and man. Its thought-content sweeps along surcharged with an impassioned eloquence, appealing not so much to Reason as to reasons deeper than Reason. Throughout, there is a wealth of homiletical material, of poetic inspiration, and spiritual insight. And so, even though not infrequently fanciful allegorizations and strained symbolisms are set forth soberly as literal truth⁸⁷ one can

⁸⁵Preface to the play, opening two paragraphs.

⁸⁶Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, pp. 18-29.

⁸⁷Thus (page 301, paragraph 335) he translates עברי as Der Mensch des Ueberganges, representative of the pioneer progressive spirit, pushing ever beyond the boundaries, cf. p. 301, sec. 234; p. 302, sec. 236; p. 296, sec. 224. All these references are to Vol. I, Die Schrift des Lebens.

not escape the contagion of their fine fervor and faith nor miss their imaginative suggestiveness.

Essentially the same characteristics show themselves in the third part, published only last year from among Stein's literary remains.⁸⁸ Here we have displayed the richest gems of Jewish ethics, flashing forth their brilliancy from the manifold facets of apothegm, tropes maxims, parables, allegories. These patiently dug from the inexhaustible mines of Bible, Talmud and Midrash are shown off to fine advantage through the rather artistic setting, which Stein gives them.

I have purposely left the discussion of the middle volume of "Die Schrift des Lebens" last, for it carries us into the resounding arena of the Reform Movement. The authority of the Talmud, the later trend of legalism and orthodox practice, Cabbalism, rationalism, the progressive issues and conflicting claims of new and old, in a word the whole compass of Ancient, Medieval, and modern Jewish Law and Life are here taken up by Stein. And though his work may not, on the one hand, have the scientific scholarship of a Löw, nor, on the other hand, sound forth the clarion proclamation tone of a constructive theologian like Geiger, nevertheless high tribute must be paid to its wide and sound knowledge, its excellent utilization of sources, its clear grasp of essential principles and its high skill in popular exposition and argumentation.

Stein's watchword is Klarheit und Wahrheit.⁸⁹ A fixed, final code, whose arbitrary prescriptions must not be questioned is against reason and conscience. Judaism, he recognizes of course, is and must ever be a religion of Law—law as the sanctification of life by the discipline of moral habits and religious duties, but not law, as expressed by tomes upon tomes of legalistic enactment based upon inverted and oft perverted hermaneutics.⁹⁰ The demand of blind obedience to a cult is as much slavery as the demand of

⁸⁸Liberales, Judenthum (Monatschrift) Nov., 1910, pp. 259-261, contains an excellent review of this last volume.

⁸⁹Vol. II, pp. 32-57, espec. top of p. 34; also page 20.

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 3-11. See particularly concluding sentence parag. 60, page 49; Vol. II.

blind faith in a creed.⁹¹ The requirements of religion must be clear in themselves, and should not need commentary upon commentary by expert theologians.⁹² Very acute in his observation that though Phariseeism started out with the lofty principle that all people are priests it ultimately defeated its own purpose by making the people dependent upon the doctors of the Law.⁹³ Stein, no more than any of the leaders of the Reform, was a Kareite, or an enemy of the Talmud; and with all his strong criticism of the pilpulism and externalism of the Talmud, he praises warmly its keen intellectually and high purpose to preserve Judaism.⁹⁴ Following Geiger, he recognizes that the principle of Oral Law represents progress⁹⁵; that indeed, there has always been progress in Judaism; but, unfortunately the later rabbinic interpretation and application of Oral Law led to its petrification.⁹⁶ "The true Oral Law," says Stein, "in its historical and natural sense, is the living word of the religious leaders and teachers of all times, whose inherent authority and responsibility it is to interpret traditions according to the light and life of their age."⁹⁷ This brief survey must suffice as an indication of Stein's general standpoints as expressed in "Die Schrift des Lebens."

STEIN AS PREACHER.

A couple of volumes of sermons⁹⁸ belong to these later years, and accordingly a few words may be in place here regarding Stein, as preacher. His pulpit gifts were all of a high order⁹⁹; a beautifully modulated voice and winsome presence being joined to the possession of a noble simplicity both of diction and sermon-structure.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 19, sec. 25. Cf. however *ibid.*, p. 126, where he distinguishes between the pressure of cult and the pressure of creed—the former only separating men externally, the latter separating them internally.

⁹²Ibid., p. 32, sec. 45.

⁹³Ibid., p. 464, article VIII. Read particularly paragraph 26, pp. 19, 20 of Vol. II.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 71, sec. 120; p. 273; secs. 384, 385.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 119, sec. 184 & ff.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 156, sec. 239.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 464, article IV; also *ibid.*, p. 155, sec. 238-239; p. 212, sec. 306.

⁹⁸*Der Kampf des Lebens*, 1870; *Aus dem Westen*, (1875).

⁹⁹*Der Orient*, 1844, under date of May 24.

ture, as well as of a rich thought-content, beautiful by a wealth of homiletic aptness. Nevertheless it is interesting to note, Stein himself confesses that even after twenty-five or thirty years of public-speaking he never ascended his pulpit without an inner palpitation and sense of stress. He always carefully wrote out his material.¹⁰⁰ The poet pervades all sermons revealed not so much through the use of flowery language as through lyric intensity of utterance and the imaginative insight into text values. This will no doubt explain his fondness for, and fine ability in, creating the succession of sermons in cycles and series—all growing out of one central idea.¹⁰¹

HIS PERMANENT PLACE.

I must, however, hurry on to my conclusion. It is perhaps futile, if not foolish, to speculate on what a man might have been and done, if he had lived in a different time and place. Nevertheless, after studying Stein's life and works, I can not help but feel how much better it would have been, if a more propitious Fortune had put the period of his activities after the issues had been fought out and won, rather than in the very thick of the fight. Not that Stein was not heart and soul for the principles of Reform: not that he did not, by tongue and pen and actual life, do much to promote the cause; not that he did not give a large measure of service and self sacrifice. But though his learning was extensive and thorough; though he had a fine mind and power of expression, yet his was not the endowment or genius of the critic-historian, the reconstructive theologian, or the practical organizer, which qualifications answered more immediately to the needs of the Reform program. He was par excellence the preacher-poet, a man of deep, spiritual nature and wide sympathies—one who needed for the best unfoldment of his powers and influence not a time distracted by the conflicts of dietary laws, the reform of

¹⁰⁰Die Schrift des Lebens, Vol. I, p. 13.

¹⁰¹Der Kampf des Lebens, 1870; Der Mensch im Lichte der Religion; die Heimkehr des Sohnes; Die Creation; Seele, wohin schausst du,—these are only a few of his sermons in cycles of five and seven. All except the first mentioned (which is a separately published booklet) appeared in the different numbers of Der Israelitische Volkslehrer, 1850-1860.

the ritual and all the petty personalities and antagonisms of a transition period; but a time open to a message of the eternal religious values.

Stein himself seems to feel this. No one can read the self-revelatory opening chapters of his "Schrift des Lebens" without feeling through them all a wistfulness and regretfulness,¹⁰² a yearning for inner harmony, a whisper, as it were, of two voices, of "Zwiespalt in sich and Zwietracht um sich."¹⁰³ This makes Stein only all the more dear to us. Pascal has said, "It is refreshing to read, expecting to learn an author, and instead finding a man." This has been my experience with Leopold Stein. In the back of poem and drama, sermon and theological treatise, is the gracious, benignant spirit, the loving, loyal personality—warm in sympathies, clear in outlook, fair in attitude—a true man and a faithful servant of God.

¹⁰²Cf. the eloquent passage in the Introd. to Stein's Transl. of Gabirol's **ספר מנחות**:—As if awakening from a beautiful dream, in which angels come down to him and stars play with him, man now from his little habitation looks out upon an eternal ocean of worlds and does not dare venture a voyage to discover its bounds. True the heavens and these worlds and the stars reveal to his more piercing vision more of the Divine Majesty; but not more in that trustful childlike spirit, but rather as one talks to a man who with his own hand has broken the playthings of his childhood.

¹⁰³Cf. Matthew Arnold's Stanzas from the Grand Chartreuse.

"Wandering between two worlds,—one dead
The other powerless to be born!"

ISAAC MAYER WISE

...FOUNDER OF...

Central Conference of
American Rabbis

PRESIDENT 1889-1900

PAST PRESIDENTS.

ISAAC M. WISE	1889-1900
JOSEPH SILVERMAN	1900-1903
JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF	1903-1905
JOSEPH STOLZ	1905-1907
DAVID PHILIPPSON	1907-1909
MAX. HELLER	1909-1911

DECEASED MEMBERS.

SAMUEL ADLER, New York.....	1891
LIEBMAN, ADLER, CHICAGO.....	1892
M. SOLOMON, Appleton, Wis.....	1892
HEINRICH ZIRNDORF, Cincinnati.....	1893
HERMAN BIRKENTHAL, Hamilton, Ont.....	1893
HENRY M. BIEN, Vicksburg, Miss.....	1895
LEON STRAUSS, Belleville, Ill.....	1895
AARON WISE, New York.....	1896
ISRAEL JOSEPH, Montgomery, Ala.....	1897
DAVID FEUERLICHT, Owensboro, Ky.....	1897
IGNATZ GROSSMANN, Chicago.....	1897
ISAAC M. WISE, Cincinnati.....	1900
I. STEMPLE, Yonkers, N. Y.	1900
ABRAHAM LAZARUS, Houston, Tex.....	1900
OSCAR J. COHEN, Mobile, Ala.....	1901
AARON LOEWENHEIM, Chicago.....	1901
ADOLPH MOSES, Louisville.....	1902
BENJAMIN SZOLD, Baltimore.....	1902
MOSES MIELZINER, Cincinnati.....	1903
GUSTAVE GOTTHEIL, New York.....	1903
E. K. FISCHER, Chattanooga.....	1903
LIPPMAN MAYER, Pittsburg.....	1904
AARON NORDEN, Chicago.....	1905
H. J. M. CHUMACEIRO, Curacao, Dutch West Indies.....	1905
ISAAC SCHWAB, St. Joseph, Mo.....	1907
RAPHAEL BENJAMIN, Brooklyn, N. Y.....	1907
EMANUEL L. HESS, St. Paul, Minn.....	1907
JUDAH WECHSLER, Indianapolis, Ind.	1907

ALOIS KAISER, Baltimore, Md.	1908
BERNARD FELSENTHAL, Chicago, Ill.	1908
JACOB VOORSANGER, San Francisco, Cal.	1908
SOLOMON SONNENSCHIN, St. Louis, Mo.	1908
ADOLPH M. RADIN, New York City	1909
JOSEPH HERZ, Columbus, Miss.	1909
L. WEISS, Bradford, Pa.	1909
SIGMUND MANNHEIMER, Cincinnati	1909
BENJAMIN A. BONNHEIM, Cincinnati	1909
EPHRAIM FELDMAN, Cincinnati	1910

OFFICERS.

FOR THE YEAR 1911-1912.

HONORARY PRESIDENT,

KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, O.

PRESIDENT,

SAMUEL SCHULMAN, New York City.

VICE-PRESIDENT,

MOSES J. GRIES, Cleveland, O.

TREASURER,

LEO M. FRANKLIN, Detroit, Mich.

RECORDING SECRETARY,

JULIAN MÖRGENSTERN, Cincinnati, O.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY,

*SOLOMON FOSTER, Newark, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

ISRAEL AARON.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
GOTTHARD DEUTSCH.....	Cincinnati, O.
HARRY W. ETTELSON.....	Hartford, Conn.
WILLIAM S. FRIEDMAN.....	Denver, Col.
EPHRIAM FRISCH	Pine Bluff, Ark.
MAXMILLIAN HELLER.....	New Orleans, La.
HARRY H. MAYER.....	Kansas City, Mo.
DAVID PHILIPSON.....	Cincinnati, O.
WILLIAM ROSENAU.....	Baltimore, Md.
ISAAC L. RYPINS.....	St. Paul, Minn.
JOSEPH STOLZ.....	Chicago, Ill.

*ADDRESS: 264 CLINTON AVE.

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1911-1912.

Publication.

A. Guttmacher,	I. Landman,	R. Grossman,
C. S. Levi,		N. Krass.

Relief Fund.

J. Stolz,	I. L. Rypins,	Henry Cohen.
-----------	---------------	--------------

Sermonic Literature.

S. Hirschberg,	A. Brill,	H. Levi,
M. Friedlander,	A. G. Moses,	George Fox,

Minister's Handbook Committee.

M. A. Meyer,	M. H. Harris,	S. Koch,
I. L. Leucht,		L. J. Kopald.

Contemporaneous History.

G. Deutsch,	Max Currick,	I. Lewinthal.
-------------	--------------	---------------

Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology.

S. Schulman,	K. Kohler,	D. Philipson,
J. Krauskopf,		W. Rosenau.

Social and Religious Union.

I. E. Marcuson,	J. Rauch,	M. Zielonka,
	D. Alexander.	

Lyceum Bureau.

L. M. Franklin,	S. G. Bottigheimer,	Max Merrit,
E. Mannheimer,		L. Bernstein.

Church and State.

W. S. Friedman,	A. Simon,	J. Krauskopf,
J. Silverman,	D. Lefkowitz,	J. B. Wise,
M. Newfield,		C. S. Levi.

Religious Work in Universities.

E. N. Calisch,	F. Cohn,	S. Koch,
H. Englander,	B. Elzas,	H. Levi,
A. Hirschberg	C. A. Rubenstein,	

Personal Prayers.

H. Berkowitz,	H. Fisher,	I. Landman,
E. Mayer,	C. A. Rubenstein,	M. Salzman.

Religious Education.

M. J. Gries,	H. Berkowitz,	H. G. Enelow,
A. Simon,	M. Landsberg,	L. Grossman,
W. Rosenau,	D. Philipson,	E. A. Calisch,
L. M. Franklin,	J. Stolz,	J. Kornfeld,
M. M. Feuerlicht,	J. H. Kaplan,	G. Solomon.

Curators of Archives.

J. Morgenstern,	J. Mielziner.
-----------------	---------------

Investments.

L. M. Franklin,	M. J. Gries,	S. Schulman.
-----------------	--------------	--------------

Responsa.

K. Kohler,	D. Neumark,
------------	-------------

Defectives, Dependents, Delinquents.

J. S. Kornfeld,	D. Blaustein,	S. C. Lowenstein,
A. Simon,		I. Klein.

Civil and Religious Marriage Laws.

J. L. Levy,	E. Frisch,	S. S. Wise.
M. Samfield,	I. Rosenthal.	

Editing Year Book.

E. Frisch,	J. Morgenstern,	M. Heller,
	D. Marx.	

Synagogal Music.

H. H. Mayer,	M. H. Harris,	F. D. Mendes,
I. Aaron,	H. Ettelson,	J. Singer,
A. Lyons,	D. Marx.	N. Stern.

Tracts.

D. Philipson,	S. Schulman,	M. Heller,
J. Stolz,		L. M. Franklin.

Finance.

S. Foster,	D. Marx,	J. Morgenstern.
------------	----------	-----------------

Summer Services.

G. Zepin,	C. J. Freund,	T. Schanfarber,
S. R. Cohen,	S. Hecht,	S. Goldenson.

Board of Arbitration.

J. Stolz,	G. B. Levi,	T. Schanfarber.
-----------	-------------	-----------------

Soliciting Fund.

J. Morgenstern,	M. J. Gries,	M. Heller,
L. M. Franklin,	S. Foster,	J. Stolz,
	D. Philipson.	

Bible Fund.

L. Harrison,	D. Philipson,	I. S. Moses,
S. Schulman,	W. H. Greenburg,	D. Marx.

Week-Day Service.

H. G. Enelow,	L. M. Franklin,	M. J. Gries.
---------------	-----------------	--------------

Synagog and Labor.

S. Foster,	J. Rappaport,	D. Lefkowitz,
D. Blaustein,	L. Mannheimer,	L. Witt.

Co-Operation in Cases of Emergency.

S. Schulman,	J. Krauskopf,	W. S. Friedman,
M. J. Gries,		D. Philipson.

TEMPORARY COMMITTEES OF THE ST. PAUL CONFERENCE.

*President's Message.*JOSEPH STOLZ, *Chairman.*

S. N. Deinard,	S. Foster,	L. M. Franklin,
W. S. Friedman,	M. J. Gries,	C. S. Levi,
D. Philipson,	I. L. Rypins,	T. Schanfarber,
S. Schulman,		L. Witt.

*Nominations.*DAVID MARX, *Chairman.*

D. Alexander,	H. W. Ettelson,	C. Freund,
J. Kornfeld,	H. H. Mayer,	J. Rauch,
W. Rosenau,		L. J. Rothstein.

*Resolutions.*H. BERKOWITZ, *Chairman.*

S. Hirschberg,	J. Rappaport,	M. Silber,
L. Witt,		M. Zielonka.

*Auditing.*G. ZEPIN, *Chairman.*

G. Fox,	A. R. Levy,	I. E. Marcuson,
	J. Morgenstern.	

*Memorial Resolutions.*G. DEUTSCH, *Chairman.*

F. Cohn,	S. H. Goldenson,	M. Lefkowitz,
	J. Singer.	

*Thanks.*I. AARON, *Chairman.*

E. Mannheimer,	J. Feuerlicht,	J. Kornfeld,
	M. Merritt.	

*Press.*D. LEFKOWITZ, *Chairman.*

S. N. Deinard,

E. Frisch,

J. Rauch,

I. L. Rypins.

*Special Committee on Recommendations in Rabbi Schanfarber's Paper.*S. SCHULMAN, *Chairman.*

H. Berkowitz,

C. S. Levi,

G. Zepin.

PREVIOUS MEETINGS OF THE CONFERENCE.

1889	Detroit, Mich.
1890	Cleveland, Ohio
1891	Baltimore, Md.
1892	Washington, D. C.
1893	Chicago, Ill.
1894	Atlantic City, N. J.
1895	Rochester, N. Y.
1896	Milwaukee, Wis.
1897	Montreal, Canada
1898	Atlantic City, N. J.
1899	Cincinnati, Ohio
1900	Buffalo, N. Y.
1901	Philadelphia, Pa.
1902	New Orleans, La.
1903	Detroit, Mich.
1904	Louisville, Ky.
1905	Cleveland, Ohio
1906	Indianapolis, Ind.
1907	Frankfort, Mich.
1908	Frankfort, Mich.
1909	New York, N. Y.
1910	Charlevoix, Mich.
1911	St. Paul-Minneapolis, Minn.

MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

November, 1911.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G., London, England.

WINTNER LEOPOLD, Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Temple Beth Elohim, Brooklyn;
411 W. 115th St., New York City.

ACTIVE MEMBERS.

Aaron, Israel, B.A., D.D., Rabbi Temple Beth Zion, 748 Auburn Ave.,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Abelson, Alter, Rabbi care 40 E. 14th St., New York City.

Alexander, David, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shomer Emoonim, 229 Win-
throp St., Toledo, Ohio.Anspacher, Abraham S., B.A., Ph.D., Rabbi Congregation Anshe Chesed,
845 Monroe Ave., Scranton, Pa.Barnstein, Henry, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 2402 Labrauch
St., Houston, Texas.Bauer, Solomon H., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth, 3116 Logan Boule-
vard, Chicago, Ill.Bergman, Moise, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Gates of Prayer, 5914 Pitt
St., New Orleans, La.Berkowitz, Henry, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 1823 N.
33d St. Philadelphia.Bernstein, Louis, B.A., Rabbi Temple Adath Joseph, 1601 Francis St.,
St. Joseph, Mo.Blatt, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Temple B'nai Israel, 1305 Dale Ave., Oklahoma
City, Okla.Blau, Joel, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaari Zedek, 588-A Monroe St.,
Brooklyn, N. Y.Blaustein, David, M.A., Lecturer N. Y. School of Philanthropy, 105 E.
22d St., New York City.

Bloch, Jacob, M.A., L.L.D., Rabbi, 586 Couch St., Portland, Oregon.

Blum, A., Rabbi, Jewish Chaplain State and City Hospitals, 138 W. 81st
St., New York.Bogen, Joseph, L.L.D., Rabbi Congregation B'nai Israel, 316 E. Baltimore
St., Jackson, Tenn.Bottigheimer, Seymour G., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 211 S.
Commerce St., Natchez, Miss.Braun, Frederick E., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Lincoln,
Nebraska.

- Brill, Abram, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Leshem Shomayim, 45 S. Broadway, Wheeling, W. Va.
- Buttenweiser, Moses, Ph.D., Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3208 Fredonia Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Calisch, Edward N., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Ahabah, 2702 Monument Ave., Richmond, Va.
- Caro, Victor, Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 237 Tenth St., Milwaukee, Wis.
- Coffee, Rudolph I., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Tree of Life, 5894 Hobart St., E.E., Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Cohen, Henry, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas.
- Cohen, Montague, N.A., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, Box 596, Butte, Mont.
- Cohen, Simon R., B.A., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, 1387 Dean St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Cohn, Frederick, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Israel, 1302 Park Ave., Omaha, Neb.
- Cronbach, Abraham, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 131 S. William St., South Bend, Ind.
- Curriek, Max C., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 523 W. 9th St., Erie, Pa.
- Deinard, Samuel N., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Shaare Tov., 513 E. 32d St., Minneapolis, Minn.
- Deutsch, G., Ph.D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3600 Wilson Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Drucker, Aaron P., Rabbi, 1813 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Egelson Louis I., Rabbi, Hebrew Congregation, Greensboro, N. C.
- Ehrenreich, Bernard C., Rabbi, Congregation Kahl Montgomery, 58 Sayre St., Montgomery, Ala.
- Elkin, Heiman J., B.A., Rabbi, 2714 Bell St., New Orleans, La.
- Elkin, Meyer, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 86 Windsor Ave., Hartford, Conn.
- Ellinger, Emil, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 120 Altura Place, Mission Hills, San Diego, Cal.
- Elzas, Barnett A., B.A., M.D., L.L.D., Rabbi, Hebrew Congregation of the Deaf, 1919 Seventh Ave., New York City.
- Enelow, H. G., D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Adath, 1258 Willow Ave., Louisville, Ky.
- Englander, Henry, M.A., Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, 1355 Myrtle Ave, W. H. Cincinnati, O.
- Ettelson, Harry W., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 136 Homestead Ave., Hartford, Conn.
- Faber, M., Rabbi, Congregation Bethel, 320 S. Colyer St., Tyler, Texas.

- Feuerlicht, Jacob, Rabbi, Superintendent, Home of Jewish Friendless, 5228 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Feuerlicht, Morris M., B.A., Rabbi, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, 2837 Washington Boulevard, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Fineshriber, William H., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel, 89 N. Bellevue, Memphis, Tenn.
- Fisher, Henry M., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 109 Seaside Ave., Atlantic City, N. J.
- Foster, Solomon, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 264 Clinton Ave., Newark, N. J.
- Fox, G. George, Ph.D., Rabbi, Beth-El Congregation, 716 1-2 Hemphill St., Fort Worth, Tex.
- Frank, Julius, Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Shalom, 1147 Franklin St., Reading, Pa.
- Franklin, Leo M., B.L., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El, 10 Edison Ave., Detroit, Mich.
- Freund, Chas. J., B.S., B.L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 524 E. 2nd South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Frey, Sigmund, Rabbi, Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum, 2033 E. 4th St., Los Angeles, Cal.
- Friedlander, Joseph, Rabbi, Congregation Shary Tefilo, 185 Main St., Orange, N. J.
- Friedlander, M., Rabbi, First Hebrew Congregation, 29 E. Moss Ave., Oakland, Cal.
- Friedman, William S., B.L., LL.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, 1060 Emerson St., Denver, Colo.
- Frisch, Ephraim, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth, 205 Martin Ave., Pine Bluff, Ark.
- Gerechter, Emanuel, Rabbi, Zion Congregation, 671 Washington St., Appleton, Wis.
- Goldenson, Samuel H., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Emeth, 551 Myrtle Ave., Albany, N. Y.
- Goldstein, Sidney E., B.A., Rabbi, Superintendent of Social Service Work, Free Synagogue, 36 W. 68th St., New York City.
- Gordon, Nathan, M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Emanuel, 68 Stanley St., Montreal, Can.
- Grad, Bennett, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 309 E. 18th St., Austin, Texas.
- Greenburg, William H., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 2603 S. Ervay St., Dallas, Texas.
- Gries, M. J., B.A., Rabbi, The Temple, 2645 E. 93d St., Cleveland, O.
- Gross, Louis Daniel, M.A., Rabbi, Akron Hebrew Congregation, 194 Beck Ave., Akron, O.
- Grossman, Rudolph, B.L., D.D., Rabbi, Temple Rodeph Shalom, 1347 Lexington Ave., New York City.

- Grossman, Louis, B.A., D.D. Professor, Hebrew Union College, Rabbi Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 2212 Park Ave., W. H. Cincinnati, O.
- Guttmacher, Adolf, Ph.D., Rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, 2239 Brookfield Ave., Baltimore, Md.
- Guttman, Adolph, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Society of Concord, 102 Walnut Place, Syracuse, N. Y.
- Harris, Maurice H., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel of Harlem, 254 W. 103d St., New York City.
- Harrison, Leon, B.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 5611 Cabanne St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Hausmann, Gustav N., Litt.D., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation, 115 W. 121st St., New York City.
- Hecht, Sigmund, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Brith, 817 Beacon St. Los Angeles, Cal.
- Heller, Max, M.L., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Sinai, 1828 Marengo St., New Orleans, La.
- Hirschberg, Abram, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Sholom, 2636 Lakeview Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Hirschberg, Samuel, M.A., Rabbi, Temple Emianu-El, 709 Stowell Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
- Isaacs, A.S., Ph.D., New York University, 447 Ellison St., Paterson, N. J.
- Jacobs, Pizer W., Ph.D., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Ahavath Chesed, 1627 Boulevard, Jacksonville, Fla.
- Jacobson, Jacob S., Ph.D., Rabbi, 1945 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
- Jacobson, Moses P., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Hebrew Zion, Shreveport, La.
- Jasin, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Beth-El Congregation, Niagara Falls, N. Y.
- Jesselson, Felix W., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Zion, 103 Pine St. Danville, Pa.
- Joseph, Theodore F., B.A., Rabbi, Third St. Temple, 75 Fourth St. Troy, N. Y.
- Kaplan, Bernard M., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Ohabai Shalome, 267 8th Ave., San Francisco, Cal.
- Kaplan, Jacob H., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Mishkan Israel, 1321 Parkman Ave., Selma, Ala.
- Klein, David, M.A., Rabbi, Petersburg, Va.
- Klein, Israel, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Zion of West Chicago, 1916 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Klein, Jacob, Rabbi, Congregation Agudath Achim, 502 Fisher St., Peoria, Ill.
- Koch, Samuel, M.A., Rabbi, Temple de Hirsch, 916 20th Ave., N. Seattle, Washington.
- Kohler, Kaufman, Ph.D., Rabbi, President Hebrew Union College, 3016 Stanton Ave., Cincinnati, O.

- Kohut, Geo. A., Ph.D., Rabbi, 254th St. and Independence Ave., Riverdale on the Hudson, New York.
- Kopald, Louis J., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, 420 E. Magnolia St., Stockton, Cal.
- Kornfeld, J. S., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Bene Israel, 376 Linwood Ave., Columbus, O.
- Kory, Sol L., B.A., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation, 1112 E. Jackson St., Vicksburg, Miss.
- Krass, Nathan, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, 690 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Krauskopf, Joseph, D.D., Rabbi, Temple Keneseth Israel, 4715 Pulaski Ave., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Kuppin, Louis, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Sholem, 1624 York St., Quincy, Ill.
- Landau, Jacob Henry, M.A., D.D., Temple Beth-El, 793 Auburn Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
- Landman, Isaac, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Keneseth Israel, 229 Apsley St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Landsberg, Max, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Berith Kodesh, 420 Main St., E. Rochester, N. Y.
- Lauterbach, J. Z., Professor, Hebrew Union College, 724 W. 6th St., Cincinnati, O.
- Lefkovits, Maurice, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 1919 E. 3d St., Duluth, Minn.
- Lefkowitz, David B.S., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 55 Richmond Ave., Dayton, O.
- Leipziger, Emil W., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, 626 Walnut St., Terre Haute, Ind.
- Leiser, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Keneseth Israel, Box 219, Allentown, Pa.
- Leucht, I. L., Rabbi, Touro Synagogue, P. O. Box 431, New Orleans, La.
- Leucht, Joseph, Rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 63 Seymour Ave., Newark, N. J.
- Levi, Chas. S., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshai Emeth, National Hotel, Peoria, Ill.
- Levi, Gerson B., M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, B'nai Shalom Temple Israel, 3540 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Levi, Harry, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 56 Verndale St., Brookline, Mass.
- Levy, Abraham R., Ph.B., Rabbi, 213 E. 48th St., Chicago, Ill.
- Levy, Edward S., Rabbi, United Hebrew Congregation, 920 N. 6th St., Ft. Smith, Ark.
- Levy, Felix A., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 561 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill.
- Levy J. Leonard, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 1526 Deniston Ave., E. Pittsburgh, Pa.

- Levy, M. S., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1225 O'Farrell St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Lewinthal, Isidore, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Ohavai Sholom, 106 20th Ave., S. Nashville, Tenn.
- Liknaitz, David L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 6th and Osage Sts., Leavenworth, Kan.
- Loewenberg, William, Rabbi, Temple Israel, 60 E. Fayette St., Uniontown, Pa.
- Lovitch, Meyer, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 1410 Broadway, Paducah, Ky.
- Lowenstein, Solomon, C., B.A., Rabbi, Superintendent Hebrew Orphan Asylum, 137th St., and Amsterdam Ave., New York City.
- Lyons, Alexander, M.A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, 526 8th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Machol, M., Ph.D., Rabbi, emeritus, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 7112 Hough Ave., Cleveland, O.
- Magnus, Judah Leon, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 23 Sutton Place, New York.
- Mannheimer, Eugene, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 201 Victoria Hotel, Des Moines, Ia.
- Mannheimer, Leo, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 282 Broadway, Paterson, N. J.
- Marcuson, Isaac E., B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, Charleston, S. C.
- Margolis, Elias, Rabbi, 550 W. 144th St., New York City.
- Marks, Samuel, Rabbi, Temple Beth-El, 114 W. Quincy St., San Antonio, Tex.
- Marx, David, B.L., Rabbi, Congregation Hebrew Benevolent, 354 Washington St., Atlanta, Ga.
- Mayer, Eli, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 2247 N. 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Mayer, Harry H., B.A., Rabbi, Temple B'nai Jehudah, 2600 E. 28th St., Kansas City, Mo.
- Mendes, F. de Sola, Ph.D., Rabbi, West End Synagogue, 154 W. 82d St., New York City.
- Mendoza, Louis D., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Olhev Sholom, 3 Raleigh Sq. Norfolk, Va.
- Merritt, Max, J., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'ne Israel, 417 First St., Evansville, Ind.
- Messing, Abraham J., Jr., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'rith Sholom, Springfield, Ill., 602 N. Main St., Bloomington, Ill.
- Messing, Aaron J., Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'nai Sholom, Temple Israel, 4533 Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Messing, Henry J., Rabbi emeritus, United Hebrew Congregation, 4439 Delmar Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

- Messing, Mayer, Rabbi emeritus, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, 527 E. 11th St., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Meyer, Julius H., B.A., Rabbi, 93330 N. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
- Meyer, Martin A., Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 2109 Baker St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Mielziner, Jacob, M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Sh'erith Israel-Ahabath Achim, 519 Prospect Place, Cincinnati, O.
- Miller, Julian H., B.A., Rabbi, Mizpah Congregation, 626 McCallie Ave., Chattanooga, Tenn.
- Morgenstern, Julian, Ph.D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3449 Hallwood Place, Cincinnati, O.
- Moses, Alfred G., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaari Shomayim, Government and Warren Sts., Mobile, Ala.
- Moses, Isaac S., Rabbi, Ahavath Chesed Shaar Hashomayim Congregation, 222 E. 61st St., New York City.
- Neumark, David, Ph.D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, "The Columbia," Winslow Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Newfield, Morris, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, 2150 S. 16th St., Birmingham, Ala.
- Newman, Julius, Rabbi, Moses Montefiore Congregation, 1522 Rockwell St., Chicago, Ill.
- Nieto, Jacob, Rabbi, Congregation Sherith Israel, 3933 Clay St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Nott, M., Rabbi, Congregation, Beth Israel, 416 W. Hemlock St., Hazelton, Pa.
- Peiser, Simon, B.A., Rabbi, Assistant Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, O., 5000 Woodlawn Ave.
- Philipsen, David, B.A., D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Bene Israel, 3947 Beechwood Ave., Rose Hill, Cincinnati, O.
- Philo, Isadore C., Rabbi, Congregation Mansfield Hebrew, 105 S. Balsch St., Akron, O.
- Raisin, Jacob S., Ph.D., B.A., Rabbi, 1345 54th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Raisin, Max, B.A., Congregation Beth Israel, P. O. Box 243, Meridian, Miss.
- Rappaport, Julius, Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 2128 Crystal St., Chicago, Ill.
- Rauch, Joseph, B.A., Rabbi, Mt. Sinai Congregation, Box 287, Sioux City, Ia.
- Reichler, Max, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Ohel Jacob, 1112 Forrest Ave., New York City.
- Rhine, Abraham, B.A., D.D., Rabbi, Congregation House of Israel, 315 W. Grand Ave., Hot Springs, Ark.
- Rosenau, William, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Shalom, 1515 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md.
- Rosenbaum, David, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, Austin, Texas.

- Rosenthal, Frank L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1225 Second Ave., Columbus, Ga.
- Rosenthal, Isidore, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaari Shomayim, 138 E. Clay St., Lancaster, Pa.
- Rosenwasser, Herman, A.M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, Baton Rouge, La.
- Rothstein, Leonard J., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Gemiluth Hassodim, 426 3d St., Alexandria, La.
- Rubenstein, C. A., B.S., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Har Sinai, 2313 Calhoun Ave., Baltimore, Md.
- Rypins, Isaac L., B.L., Rabbi, Mount Zion Hebrew Congregation, 896 Lincoln Ave., St. Paul, Minn.
- Sadler, Bernard, Rabbi, Congregation Covenant of Peace, 909 Jackson St., Easton, Pa.
- Sale, Samuel, D.D., Ph.D., Rabbi, Shaareth Emeth Congregation, 4010 W. Bell St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Salzman, Marcus, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Brith, 94 W. Ross St., Wilkes Barre, Pa.
- Samfield, Max, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel, 218 Adams Ave., Memphis, Tenn.
- Schanfarber, Tobias, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Ma'yriv, 4017 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Schlesinger, Max, Ph.D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation Beth Emeth, 334 Hudson Ave., Albany, N. Y.
- Schrieber, Emanuel, Ph.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 59 N. 61st St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Schulman, Samuel, D.D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 55 E. 92d St., New York City.
- Schwarz, Jacob D., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 115 W. Wright St., Pensacola, Fla.
- Schwarz, Samuel, T.M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 18th Apollo Apartments, E. 59th St., Cleveland, O.
- Sessler, M., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, 1111 Henry St., Roanoke, Va.
- Silber, Mendel, B.A., M.D., Rabbi, Congregation Albert, 114 S. 7th St., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
- Silberfeld, Julius, Rabbi, B'nai Abraham Congregation, 346 High St., Newark, N. J.
- Silverman, Joseph, D.D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 45 E. 75th St., N. Y.
- Simon, Abram, Ph.D., Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation, 2802 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.
- Singer, Jacob, M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 105 W. Jackson St., York, Pa.
- Solomon, George, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Mickve Israel, 1516 Drayton St., Savannah, Ga.

- Solomon, Michael G., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, 111 S. Figueron St., Los Angeles, Cal.
- Spiegel, Adolph, Rabbi, W. 119th St., New York.
- Spitz, M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai El, Room 1036 Syndicate Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.
- Stern, Louis, Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation, 1315 Columbia Road, Washington, D. C.
- Stern, Nathan, Ph.D., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El, 509 Public St., Providence, R. I.
- Stolz, Joseph, D.D., Rabbi, Isaiah Temple, 4827 Langley Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Stolz, Joseph Henry, Ph.D., Rabbi Temple of Israel, 50 Division St., Amsterdam, N. Y.
- Ungerleider, M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Abraham, 4335 Calumet Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Volmer, Leon, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 1598 Lee St., Charleston, W. Va.
- Warsaw, Isidore, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Rodef Sholom, Waco, Texas.
- Weinstein, Aaron L., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 1230 Porter St., Helena, Ark.
- Weiss, Harry, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 454 New St., Macon, Ga.
- Willner, Wolff, B.A., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Adath Jeshurun, 1109 Hamilton St., Houston, Texas.
- Wise, Jonah B., B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 700 Davis St., Portland, Ore.
- Wise, Stephen S., D.D., Ph.D., Rabbi, The Free Synagogue, 23 W. 90th St., New York.
- Witt, Louis, B.A., Congregation B'nai Israel, 1022 W. 6th St., Little Rock, Ark.
- Wolf, Horace J., M.A., Rabbi, Congregation Berith Kodesh, Rochester, N. Y.
- Wolfenstein, Samuel, Ph.D., Rabbi, Superintendent, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, O.
- Wolsey, Louis, B.A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, Garfield Apartments, Cleveland, O.
- Yudelson, Albert B., M.D., Rabbi, South Side Hebrew Congregation, 4539 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Zepin, George, B.A., Rabbi, Director, Department of Synagogue and School Extension, U. A. H. C., 90 Carew Bldg., 5th and Vine Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Zielonka, Martin, B.A., Rabbi, Temple Mt. Sinai, Box 817, El Paso, Tex.

THE BLOCH PUBLISHING COMPANY, 40 E. Fourteenth Street,
New York City, has exclusive charge of the sale of the Publi-
cations of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

BM
30
C4
v.20-21

Central Conference of Ameri-
can Rabbis
Yearbook

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

